

The Australasian Catholic Record

A Quarterly Publication under Ecclesiastical Sanction

"Pro Ecclesia Dei." St. Augustine.

Contents:

APOSTLES OF TO-MORROW,

V. Rev. J. T. McMahon, M.A., Ph.D., H.Dip.Ed. 125
The discipleship of Christ calls for mental fitness (continued).

THE CO-REDEMPTION DISCUSSION,

Rev. William Keane, S.J. 134

AN IRISH CURÉ OF ARS Rev. G. O'Neill, S.J. 147

Father Henry Young, Apostle of Catholic Dublin.

IN DIEBUS ILLIS, XI John O'Brien 155

MORAL THEOLOGY AND CANON LAW,

Rt. Rev. J. J. Nevin, D.D., D.C.L. 174
The Vow of Obedience.

BOOK REVIEWS 181

DESIGN FOR DEMOCRATS.

NATIONAL CATHOLIC ALMANAC.

THE MOTHER OF JESUS (Father James, O.F.M.Cap.).

A CRITIC LOOKS AT THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

(Rev. H. A. Johnston, S.J.).

"JUST SEVENTEEN" (Rev. Reginald Walker, C.S.Sp., M.A.).

Nihil Obstat :

RICHARDUS COLLENDER

CENSOR DEPUTATUS.

Imprimatur :



NORMANNUS,

ARCHIEP. SYDNEYENSIS.

Die 1a Julii, 1945.

Apostles of To-morrow

VI. THE DISCIPLESHIP OF CHRIST ASKS FOR MENTAL FITNESS.

(Continued).

4th Step: Correction of the Essay.

The essays written are submitted to the teacher for correction, or what the Guild calls censorship. They are returned to the pupils who re-write the censored parts and polish up the essay. This writing up and correction is not the work of a day, for a pupil is free to bring the censorship of any part of his essay before the class for discussion, or to the teacher to know why those parts are inadmissible. The correction thus calls for more work, and time outside class-hours.

5th Step: Selecting the Lecturer.

On choosing the lecturer, various courses may be adopted. One may select the best written essay, or the essay of a pupil who is good on his feet and able to defend what he has written, or the lecturer may be chosen by chance, e.g., picking a name out of a hat, guessing a number or cutting a pack of cards. The pupils enjoy these chance selections. Whoever is picked must go ahead with the lecture, no matter how weak the victim appears to be. Let no one off. The chosen lecturer is then given a set time, say a week, to prepare for the presentation of the essay to the class. Whenever possible the whole paper should be committed to memory. Of course where time presses, or the pupil is very weak, the paper may be read; but this is exceptional, for when read the matter will be less convincing and less personal even to the lecturer himself. During this week's preparation the chosen lecturer should be given extra assistance; supplied with reference books with the relevant parts marked, and anything that may help him to answer objections should be given readily. The class will not be idle. Their work is to hunt up objections to the thesis, any kind of an objection, old and new. The lecturer is helped by his class-mates notifying him that they are going to bring up such an objection. The teacher may also take the lecturer on a run over the main objections. This, of course, should be done outside class. With the weaker pupils, the teacher should coach them on the delivery of the lecture, on the arguments to stress, and on the answers to many of the objections. There is nothing gained by allowing a weak pupil to make a show of himself. The Guild method aims at giving the weak pupils self-confidence, for they also have a part to play in the apostolate,—an important part, maybe, for their retiring manner and self-diffidence are often baits that attract men who will not approach the more brilliant and self-assertive types.

6th Step: The private defence.

When the time comes for the lecture the class should be prepared to put objections. Insist on every pupil having at least one objection ready. Do not let the talkative few usurp the floor. There are two Guild rules to be observed, namely, (1) irrelevant questions are not answered, and (2) questions that the lecturer cannot answer are referred

to a competent authority, the teacher. Who shall put the objections? A few pupils may be appointed to object, and the rest to come from the class at random. At the outset the whole class are invited to ask questions. To make sure that the weak members do not leave it all to the others, it is wise to include some of them always among the appointed objectors.

To be of value, questions should be as carefully prepared as their answers. Direct pupils to write out the questions they intend asking. May a pupil ask a question which he cannot answer himself? Yes, otherwise we might stifle questions. The fact of writing out the questions and objections beforehand will set the pupil's mind working on the problem, and he is bound to consult his class-mates, reference-books, parents and teacher, so that he has a shrewd idea of the answer. If the lecturer catches on, there are bound to be many impromptu questions and objections. Let them come, for the aim of the private defence is to provoke the class to attack and the lecturer to stand up to the barrage.

This class defence is a private affair, and there is no anxiety about slips or failures, because this is a training, a rehearsal; and there are always mistakes, stiffness, and awkwardness at rehearsals. That is what a rehearsal is for, to overcome stage fright, and to bring out mistakes so that they can be corrected. It is an advantage, therefore, to have these defences out of school, because the more free and buoyant the atmosphere, the better. The class room has a formal and judicial air. Another place will catch better the spirit of freedom and the sparkle of humour that hovers over the "soap-boxes" at Catholic Evidence Guild meetings in the park. Some school sodalities, for example, run an Evidence Guild Group themselves, with a teacher to help, advise and train. The private defence might be staged where the sodality meets.

7th Step: The "Grand Act".

The Audience: The central feature of the Guild Method is the public meeting of the school once a week, once a fortnight, or once a month. The meeting is best held in the evening in some large hall. To it the whole secondary school is invited and as many of the staff as possible. The method will never survive the sneers of the staff, and unless they are enthusiastic, it were better not to attempt this way of teaching.

Pupils from other schools may be invited to come and heckle the speakers. Parents are to be made very welcome, in the hope that we may win the home's interest, and that the questions raised may be discussed again within the family circle.

Each senior pupil might be asked to bring along one non-Catholic friend. As the lecturers presume that the audience is like that of the park meetings of the Catholic Evidence Guild, that is, a majority of non-Catholics, the language cannot be theological. Extracts from the Catechism must be translated into the ordinary way of speech. The non-Catholic must recognise much of his own view-point in the questions hurled at the speaker. There is a special case for mixed mar-

riages. Even the children of such homes canvass both their parents to attend. It were better that the children sit with them, for the non-Catholic parent is inclined to be self-conscious and shy. It will give them quite a thrill when one of their own family stands up and shoots his objection at the speaker.

The President:

Presiding over the meeting will be the teacher in charge of the Guild, a priest, or where possible a Guild-master whose experience of the firing-line in the park would be invaluable. An outside president adds considerably to the occasion. The president may veto any question not relative to the lecturer's topic. He may ask questions, but he must not answer any of the objections, for if he does the speaker fades out and he is left to face the whole battery of questions. The president must have a mighty patience. He may have to listen in silence while heresy is propounded from the school platform. But a sense of humour will save him, and if he can create an atmosphere of smiles, he need not worry about the ill effects of the heresies spoken by the pupils. He will note the questions that have been unsatisfactorily answered, and when the time allotted to each speaker has expired, the president will repeat these questions, give the right answers, and emphasise the fact that the speaker's answers were wrong. He may also compliment the speaker on his delivery, manner, or general preparation.

The Lecture:

Three or four prepared lectures are sufficient for one meeting. The pupil's lecture will take about ten minutes to speak. The main portion of it should be an exposition in simple language of the subject chosen; then a proof or defence of the subject drawn from reason, Sacred Scripture, tradition, history, or the authority of the Teaching Church. Since the lecturer presumes that at these public meetings the majority of those he is addressing are non-Catholics, he cannot consider theological terms as understood. His concern is with ideas, not words. He cannot help himself with ready-made phrases from the Catechism or manual of Christian Doctrine, the full meaning of which he has not considered. He must explain all terms used, and thus he is compelled to think through the doctrine so that he may accurately explain it. He has to go further, and search for words and examples and illustrations that will convey his ideas to this very mixed gathering. Mr. Frank Sheed, the introducer of the Guild Method into Australian schools, considers the exposition is of major importance. He writes: "The work of showing what a doctrine means is the speaker's principal occupation on the platform. And this is more than a matter of definition. It means showing all that the doctrine implies, what things flow from it."¹

His successor, Mr. Gallagher, as Guildmaster to the Dominican Girls' High Schools in Sydney, agrees:

"The average person outside the Church, and most of those inside it, need exposition rather than proof. Explanation of a doctrine is more than half the battle; showing its reasonableness so that the listen-

ers will give it their vote to be true is more than half the rest, and proof is the fraction that remains. Every section must be as simple as possible, and the Scripture texts must be few and telling."²

The Speakers:

Every member of the senior classes should lecture in turn, as far as possible. To concentrate on a few brilliant members of the class will defeat the object in view. Easier subjects can be allotted to those who find the work difficult, but none should be exempt. In the case of a very weak member of the class, allow him to read his paper and to have the answers to the objections he is expecting ready to consult, and even to read from his notes. Every pupil should experience what it feels like to face an audience for the sake of his Church. The rule then stands that each pupil will be called upon in his turn to give a lecture in public, and to stand on his feet while his classmates are sniping at him with questions. This is the real test of the Guild Method. It goes back to the "disputation" of the schools of theology and philosophy. In the mediaeval universities and centres of learning the "disputatio" created intellectual activity. Unfortunately it degenerated to splitting hairs in its eagerness to analyse every proposition into innumerable shades and distinctions. The Jesuit code of education known as the *Ratio Studiorum* adapted with good effect the principles of the "disputatio" to their schools. Pupils were divided into rival camps within the classroom, and the spirit of competitive heckling made teaching active and alive. By setting one group against another in a quizz game on the week's work, the teacher vacated the unpleasant role of investigator and questioner on work done, and delegated that unwelcome task to the pupils themselves. It proved a fine revision exercise, and a test that quickly uncovered the weak spots for the teacher to strengthen. To-day the "disputatio" is active in major seminaries where a student is called upon to defend publicly against all-comers his "thesis sheet." That, on a smaller scale, we are asking the pupils of secondary school age to do. Practice shows that this is not at all beyond them. In some English colleges the senior boys actually speak from Guild platforms. Those boys are, of course, older and more mature than the majority of their Australian fellows, but we must not underestimate the capacity of well-educated pupils who may be much younger. The Dominican Sisters in Sydney are well satisfied with the capacity of their girls to tackle the "disputatio." They will soon have completed twenty years of the Guild Method. And the pioneer of the method in Australia, Mr. F. J. Sheed, sums up all that he feels about its results by saying:

"If my own faith needed any confirming, it would get it from the joy that even children take in the intellectual content of such dogmas as the Incarnation and the Supernatural Life."³

¹ & ²Both quotations from "The Catholic Evidence Guild in Secondary Schools," by Sr. M. Anselm, O.P.—E. J. Dwyer, Sydney, 1939, p. 9.

³A letter from Mr. F. J. Sheed quoted in "The Catholic Evidence Guild in Secondary Schools," by Sr. M. Anselm, O.P.—E. J. Dwyer, Sydney, 1939, p. 48.

Ten Minutes' heckling:

When the lecture is finished, and not until it is finished, the president invites any member of the audience to ask questions, or put forward another point of view from that of the lecturer. It is advisable to have one or two pupils appointed to stand up immediately and shoot a prepared question. This will save valuable minutes and will rouse the others to action. After each objection the president will smilingly invite one and all to stand up and snipe at his Aunt Sally.

The lecturer repeats the objection in some such formula as: The objection (or the question) is: Christ said: "The Father is greater than I", thereby implying that He was not God. This repetition of the objection rivets the audience's attention to the answer. The heckler remains standing until the answer is given, and if he disagrees, he says so.

The lecturer's answers are to be as brief and as clear as possible. That is the test of the speaker's understanding. No one is able to defend unless he is able to explain. As the President has announced that there is no restriction on the type or number of questions and objections, provided of course that they are relevant to the one topic of the lecture, the lecturer will have to face objections he will never have heard in class. That is inevitable at a public meeting. How will the lecturer tackle these unforeseen attacks? He may have the weapons in his armoury which he has prepared very thoroughly. It is this expectation, and perhaps, fear, that urges pupils to go as deeply as they can into the subject of their talk, delving into "Radio Replies" for unusual objections, reading the context of the Scripture quotations, seeking offshoots of the topic in the history of the Church, and reinforcing his treatment with the traditional teaching of the Fathers. He may be lucky to be able to defend his wicket, but generally, up come a few swift ones bowled in a spirit of humorous devilment, just to see how they will be returned.

The lecturer will repeat the objection slowly. This gives him time to recall the plan which he learned in class, whereby he can deduct from the objector's statement what his premises are. Are those premises correct? If so, see if the conclusion follows on necessarily from such premises. Examine what particular aspect of the lecture is attacked, and re-state that for the benefit of the audience as well as the objector. Use some set form of words, for example: "What the objector is attacking is as follows. . . ." When quotations from the Scriptures are necessary in the reply, the lecturer will always read them accurately, mentioning chapter and verse. A New Testament for that purpose is always on the platform.

Training in meeting the unexpected question:

Training pupils to use a plan into which objections may fit avoids much irrelevant talk. If pupils use this plan during the private defenses in their class-rooms, they will automatically fall back upon it in public. It is a splendid preparation for sifting and searching the propaganda against the Church in the written and spoken word.

But if a swift one is too tricky, and the lecturer cannot return it, then let him smilingly admit that he is bowled. To show impatience, temper, or irritability is poor sportsmanship and worse apologetics. The lecturer should have learned from the private defences in the class-room, the practice at the nets, we may say, to build a Catholic mind which looks upon all objections with confidence and equanimity, knowing that there is a sound answer to them all, for truth cannot contradict Truth Itself, which is God. Falling back on that, the lecturer will say with assurance that even though he does not know the answer to this objection, an answer does, and must exist. The president smiles agreement, and holds back the answer until the heckling is over. Providing against the unforeseen question, which may be expected from any mass-gathering, will keep the teacher student-minded.

Preparation for the public Guild meeting may run on these lines. Each member of the class may be asked to deliver a short lecture, and then stand up to the vigorous battery of the class. The class may be divided into two camps, as was done so effectively under the *Ratio Studiorum* of the Jesuits, and one side defend and the other attack a number of propositions; for example, the twelve articles of the Apostles' Creed. The following is another good device for training in answering objections: Give out a list of about twenty objections to the whole class. Allow them a week to hunt up the answers from any source, including the teacher, out of class time. Then call on members of the class to answer one of the objections and to face the heckling of the class. Much doctrine can be learned in this way. One might with profit devote a whole public meeting to answering questions. Instead of three or four prepared papers, a group of half a dozen pupils may take the platform where each one would stand up for ten minutes to answer questions. And in this, every member of the class should take a turn.

The public "disputatio" is a fine check-up on teaching. Teachers will find no better opportunity of studying the results of their lessons than by listening to their pupils' expositions and answers on these occasions. Their part in the "disputatio" is a watching brief, while their pupils mount the witness-stand to give evidence on the quality of the teaching they have received to meet objections to their faith. The hecklers will quickly uncover the weak points, and many a teacher will bow his head in humility, and acknowledge that a different form of question must be devised for the class-room, for the internal oral and written examinations of the schools.

Theological Cases:

In theological studies much is made of the "casus", or the solving of practical cases which set students the task of applying the principles they have learned to the solution of individual problems. This exercise, like the solving of problems in Euclid, often teaches more of the inner meaning of the doctrine than the exposition of the teacher. The "casus" tests whether students are dealing with words or ideas. Through these practical cases the study of moral theology is elevated from being

a mere academic exercise into the facing of living, actual problems which real people have to meet and solve.

The "casus" creates a correlation of subjects which is not seen by students in the explanation, which tends to isolation and sectional treatment. The "casus" collects and invites all that may help towards the solution of the problem. The individual ends are joined and knit together to form a whole.

The "casus" is also a profitable way of teaching indirectly, whose results often stick when those of the formal lesson have faded and gone. For students of theology, and indeed for all students, young and old, there is more interest and life in exploring how a thing works than in any abstract explanation of it, no matter how carefully given.

The Guild method seeks those desirable fruits of the practice of the "casus" through a different form of question, both in the class-room and in the internal oral and written examinations of the secondary school. The questions are devised to meet the challenge of the hecklers in the public "disputatio". In class the questions will demand more than a memorised information; they will search the pupils' ideas and probe for misconceptions, and they will demand an ability to apply what they have learned to life-situations. Through questions, the teachers will inter-relate the term examinations, oral and written, with the work covered during Catholic Evidence periods of study and "disputatio". For example, in the term tests we shall see much more of the following questions:

1. How would you prove that Christ is God?
2. How would you answer the following objections? (Give four or five treated in class, and debated in the "disputatio".)
3. Quote some texts from the Sacred Scriptures that might be regarded as difficulties and objections against a doctrine of Faith, and ask the students to explain these to an enquiring non-Catholic.

Through this deliberate linking of questions in class with questions in the tests and with questions from the "disputatio", none of the pupils is neglected; each one, besides taking his turn on the stage, must exercise his mind on the problems aroused by these questions. The charge against the Guild Method, that it trains only those few who can think on their feet before an audience, fails if teaching is built upon these searching questions.

A correlation of the various parts of the study of religion is made through the adaptation of the "casus" to secondary schools. We teach doctrine, liturgy, history and sacred scripture at different periods on set days. Of course, that is a reasonable and sensible mode of attack on such a many-sided subject as religion. But what we separate in our treatment may grow up permanently divorced in the mind of the pupil, unless we put a problem to him whose solution necessarily unites these individual aspects of the same subject. Thus a pupil learning the Catechism, rarely, if ever, connects Sacred Scripture with it. The doctrine is not seen as the foundation stone upon which worship and liturgy rest. Bible History loses its sense of actuality when we omit maps and contemporary history. The prayers we set for memorising are not synopses

of doctrine to the pupil who is bothered only with the idea of memorising these sets of words. In our current teaching of religion, much of what we do is only words as far as the pupils are concerned. We shall continue along that pleasant routine way unless we are prised away from it by the revelations of the private and public defences of the Faith, which is the blood stream of the Guild Method. In this new way, the teacher's role is to devise questions which go beneath memorised formulae, to move aside the curtains of words to uncover ideas.

A breath of reality into the class-rooms:

If we teachers of religion still believe in the efficacy of our present approach to pupils, let us hold a Guild meeting without previous adaptation of class training, and as we listen to the feeble struggles of our pupils to apply their theoretical knowledge to the problem questions, we will shake our heads, and, if we are wise, laugh at and with our pupils. When Mr. F. J. Sheed entered the class-rooms of the Dominican Sisters at Strathfield, Sydney, he brought such a breath of reality from the market-place that texts were swept off their desks, whirled around the room, and blown through the windows. Under his vigorous battery the pupils' defence was quickly silenced, and therein was planned a new style of lesson to meet this cold wind of reality. Not until Mr. Sheed brought the questions which were hurled at his soap-box in the Sydney Domain, had the Sisters or their pupils realized how centuries out-of-date their armour had become. They knew how Arius strayed from orthodoxy, but not how their own Sydney Dr. Angus of the Presbyterian Church did. They could answer why Henry VIII. was refused a divorce, but they did not know why Marconi apparently could be divorced and afterwards be married in the Catholic Church. They saw the injustice of Mohammedan conversions by the sword, but Hitler's racial theories and marriage laws had never agitated their minds. The usurpation by the State of the lands and property of the Monasteries, and the pillaging of the Sanctuary by petted families aroused them, but they were not quite sure of their arguments against the Communist attack on private property. In literature they were trained to seek the mind of the Creator in His works, but no one directed them to examine the philosophy of life embodied in a popular film. The press statements and radio utterances of our intellectuals and prominent people were not brought into the religion period to be analysed and answered. They were never urged to join the crowd around the soap-boxes in the Domain and listen to hoary old jibes and attacks upon the Church rejuvenated in the catch-phrases and slang of to-day. Unless we adopt the Guild method, how are we to keep the windows of the school wide open for all these present-day winds to blow upon us, bringing with them the cold snap and bite of reality? The Guild Method is, as far as I know, the best and the pleasant way of doing this. In the class and public defence sessions we have a vivified form of asking "whys"—the why of what one says and hears, the why of what one sees and reads, the why of one's actions, and the why of one's thoughts. Through the Guild Method the eagerness of debate and discussion will lend interest to the religion class as

it has always done to History or English. Our pupils are more animated, alive and alert discussing historical events or literary personages because they come from life and either attract or repel us. Religion taught apart from, and independent of the current scene becomes a mere academic exercise. There is a routine sing-song about it. It is a theoretical subject with no urgent bearing upon living day-by-day in this tremendously interesting age. Pupils from our schools have come to me during their first years at the University bemoaning their lack of equipment to meet the subtle digs from the rostrum and the frank questions from their fellows. They knew their apologetics, but did not recognise the old enemies now clothed in the fluffy and breezy words of the undergraduate vocabulary. They also felt that there was too much "hush! hush!" in the advanced classes in religion. They claimed, and rightly so, that every act of Faith must be preceded by an exercise of reason. To meet those charges, and we should meet them, we teachers of religion must freshen up our eyes and tune up our ears so that we may bring into our classes questions robed in the language of the youth of to-day.

Uncovers the weakness of our teaching:

The final point is that through the "disputatio" in class-room and public hall, we teachers see the gaps and weak points in our teaching. Without that test, these weaknesses may never have been uncovered, and on we might go for years, never conscious of the need of renewing our stock-in-trade and refurbishing some of our rusty tools.

For the pupils, the "disputatio" will teach them many things, indirectly, occasionally, as Christ taught on earth. It will also teach them something that may never be taught otherwise, namely, the manner of bringing their theory to bear upon a practical point, and the way to fit a particular point into a general principle. Pupils may know their Catholic principles, but they must learn how to apply them. That necessary training comes through practice. This is an art that requires repetition after repetition, seeing someone do, and then attempting to do the same oneself.

From participation in the "disputatio", pupils will go out from our schools with at least one highly desirable gift: they have become cautious and slow to accept anything at its face-value. They pull themselves up, just as a horse shies at something out of the ordinary, and draws back on his hind legs until he sniffs and peers at this obstacle on his path. Pupils trained on how to handle an objection, however nasty and ugly it may look, will not be rushed into admitting any charge against the Church. Their practice will give them pause to ask questions and to suspend judgment until they examine the premises of this proposition. Based on the theological "casus", this training will develop a Catholic mind which will not by-pass any argument against the Faith. A Catholic-minded person does not shrug his shoulders and let the accusation pass. No, he supplements his inability to give a straight answer to a straight question by assuring his opponent that an answer does exist, and that he will seek it. To pull oneself up, and hold up agreement is fine preparation for modern living.

J. T. McMAHON.

The Co-Redemption Discussion

In the *Australasian Catholic Record* for January, 1926, Dr. W. Leonard discussed a subject which, as he said, was of actual interest, 'The B.V.M., Mediatrix of Graces'. He referred to the widespread desire that the Pope would define the doctrine of Mary's Universal Mediation. Such a definition would declare, in appropriate terms, that, of all the graces merited for men by Christ, none is actually received except through Mary's mediation. The definition expected at the time Dr. Leonard wrote would have affirmed Mary's unique position in the distribution of the grace of Christ.

Nearly twenty years have passed. No definition has been made. Yet the doctrine is not questioned by any theologian. It is frequently referred to in papal and other official utterances as if it were taken for granted. Its roots in tradition, its dogmatic basis have been fully exposed. Petitions for the definition of the dogma have reached the Holy See in large numbers. Why the delay? Apart from the traditional unshakable of the Church in declaring a truth to be a part of the deposit of faith, we may suggest that there is another reason for postponing action. At the time Dr. Leonard wrote, another question connected with our Lady's place in the scheme of salvation had begun to attract the attention of theologians. It was suggested that Mary not only distributed the graces of Redemption, but that she also had merited them; that she, while subordinate to Christ, still immediately shared in earning for man the same graces as Christ earned for the race. Until her part in the Redemption has been clarified by discussion of this idea Rome may decide to leave the whole question undefined.

That Mary was mediately or indirectly in close association with the work of redeeming us, that we are indirectly indebted to her for Christ's redeeming work has always been one of the truths treasured by her children. In the present providence of God the coming of the Word in Flesh depended on her free consent. Because of that foreseen consent and the consequent merits of Christ, she received from God the privilege of her Immaculate Conception and her fulness of grace. When giving her consent she knew that her Son would save His people from their sins, that He would be a Victim for sin. In receiving Him from God she at the same moment offered Him as the Victim, and the beginning of her motherhood was the beginning of her sacrifice. She became at once the Mother of the Man of Sorrows and the Queen of Sorrows. On her fell the office of nurturing, tending, preparing the Victim for the Sacrifice. Her life was intimately linked with all the mysteries of His life of merit, of adoration, of union with the divine purpose. By His will she stood in the streets of Jerusalem, the Mother of the Malefactor, and watched Him go by. As He passed along the Way of the Cross He saw that there was no sorrow like to her sorrow. In the greatest hours of human story, the hours when Christ's sacrifice moved to its close, she was on the hill of sacrifice. She offered her sorrows

in union with His. She endured her Compassion. She united her will with His in the offering of His life. In the words of Benedict XV, (Inter Sodalicia, 22 March, 1918): "She suffered and almost died with her Son, suffering and dying. To such an extent did she, for man's salvation, abdicate her mother's rights over her Son, to such an extent did she, to appease God's justice, immolate her Son as far as it lay with her, that it can be rightly said that she, together with Christ, redeemed the human race." Finally "she is the Mediatrix of all graces to us and, with her Son, the most powerful cooperatrix in the redemption of the human race." (S.C.R., 31 May, 1933.).

So far there is agreement. All pay tribute to Mary's merits. But it was taken for granted that her merits were themselves part of the fruit of redemption. She merited like ourselves, as one redeemed. She was not a redeemer. She could not merit her own redemption, nor our redemption, which is one with hers. But in 1920 a new development occurred. The Belgian hierarchy decided to apply to the Holy See for a Mass and Office in honour of the Mediatrix of All Graces. Cardinal Mercier, on behalf of the Bishops, asked Canon Lebon, of the theological faculty in the University of Louvain, to prepare the Mass and Office. Canon Lebon had long been interested in our Lady's part in the Redemption and had formed the opinion that our Lady had, with Christ, but in a subordinate way, merited condignly the fruits of our redemption. In his view Mary did not merely mediate between us and Christ, acting as a go-between in distributing the graces He had won for us. She was a go-between, like Christ Himself, between us and the Trinity. She does not only mediate between us and Christ, the meritorious cause of grace, but between us and the Trinity, the efficient cause of grace. As the Trinity used Christ's humanity as the instrumental and meritorious cause of grace, so it used Mary. It was decided not to make this doctrine explicit in the liturgical forms, but to draw up a Mass and Office in terms that could be accommodated to either view of our Lady's share in redemption. The Invitatory, based on St. Bernard's sermon 'De Aquaeductu', read: "*Deum omnipotentem qui omnia nos habere voluit per Mariam, venite adoremus.*". The prayer of the day began: "*Omnipotens sempiterne Deus . . .*" Benedict XV, 'not adverting to the doctrinal import' (so Fr. Sylvester O'Brien, O.F.M., in the Irish Ecclesiastical Record, 1941, I. p. 196), suggested both Invitatory and prayer be directed to the Redeemer. This was done, 'and when the doctrinal import was pointed out, it was too late to change.' (ibid). The Invitatory now runs: 'Christum Redemptorem etc. . .', and the prayer runs: "Domine Jēsu Christe, noster apud Patrem Mediator, qui beatissimam Virginem, matrem tuam quoque nostram et apud te Mediatrixem constituere dignatus, etc. . .". Thus the Mass and Office state Mary's universal mediation, but cannot be used to show that she is on the same footing as Christ in the function of redeeming. Rather they provide a negative argument against the new opinion. The Mass and Office, thus revised, were granted to Belgium on Jan. 21, 1921, and may be granted to such dioceses as ask for them. The Feast

was fixed for May 31. From that year the discussion of our Lady's place in the economy of redemption spread through the theological schools, and an increasing number of theologians is found defending the new doctrine. Readers understand, of course, that the doctrine is called 'new', merely for convenience. Should it receive authoritative approval we shall know it is as old as the deposit of faith once delivered to the Apostles.

So far there is not uniform terminology for the statement of the new doctrine nor do its supporters always make clear what they are propounding. Most speak of the 'immediate' participation of our Lady in the act of redemption. Bainvel, however, has given a different meaning to the term "immediate", in his classical treatment of Mediation in the DAFC. Indeed whenever by our prayers we obtain grace for others we are said by some to participate 'immediately' in their redemption. What the supporters of the new doctrine wish to affirm when they speak of Mary's immediate participation in redemption is that she did not merely share in redemption by her generation, nurture and renunciation of Christ but that, in her own right, though subordinately to Him, she effected the redemption of the human race. But the term is not clear unless the context shows in what sense it is used. A similar difficulty meets those who use the word 'Co-redemptrix' to describe our Lady as effecting the redemption. Billot, in his preface to Bainvel's 'Marie, Mère des Graces', objected to the use of the term at all. Since he wrote, however, the Popes have frequently used the term about our Lady; but as they have also applied it to all members of the Mystical Body who share in Catholic Action, its connotation depends on the context and it is therefore not a term with a fixed meaning. Perhaps the ordinary scholastic terminology helps best to make clear what is the precise point at issue in this discussion. Christ, by His Passion and Death, merited condignly for men the graces needed if man is to be restored to the friendship of God and to attain the Beatific Vision. This action of Christ is redemption *in actu primo*, primary, objective, sufficient redemption. But those graces are not actually and fruitfully received without human co-operation. Such co-operation is called Redemption *in actu secundo*, secondary, subjective, efficient redemption. All taking part in such secondary redemption, in the application of primary redemption to themselves and others, are co-redeemers. That Mary is the principal co-redeemer *in actu secundo*, that all such redemption is owing to her, is now agreed to by all. But is she co-redeemer in a higher sense, in the sense that she shares with Christ the office of redeemer *in actu primo*, meriting condignly for us the fruits of redemption? Formerly theologians would have replied negatively. Now many assign to her such a prerogative. They do not say that her redemptive act is of the same value as Christ's. Though associated with Him she remains subordinate, and it is only because of her relation to Him that her redeeming act has condign merit. Nor is she to be regarded as carrying out a minor part of the redemption while Christ carries out the major part. Christ and our Lady are each to be re-

garded as meritorious causes of the whole effect of redemption, much as the concurrent activity of the First Cause and of a creature causes the whole effect of a creature's act, though the causes are diversely related to the effect. Some analogy might be drawn from the position of a King and his Queen. When a king comes to the throne his wife is, usually speaking, not merely his consort. She is Queen. In one sense she is a subject. Yet she reigns; she has her own function as head of the state. She is not regarded as set between the king and his subjects; she is on the same level of royalty as the king. Yet her position and power are not independent of his. They are derived through his and are subordinate to his. Somewhat in this way Mary fulfils two parts. She is a mediator between the God-man and the human race. Yet, in another capacity, she is on a level with the God-man and exercises a mediation, subordinate indeed to His, yet like His, between the Triune God and men.

The new doctrine has won support from writers of different theological schools. Its first exponent is said to have been Fr. de Medrano, S.J., who wrote in 1702. As we shall see, his doctrine has an earlier theological basis. More recently, the main support for it has come from the Louvain faculty and from the Franciscans, who might seem to be taking the same part as they took in the long discussions that elucidated the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. The disputants approach the question from opposite sides. Those favouring the doctrine say that it is the clear teaching of the Roman Pontiffs and is in the tradition of the Church. Accordingly, they say, if theological teachings conflict with it, so much the worse for the teachings. Such teachings need re-examining, clarifying, correcting. Their opponents say that the new doctrine is out of harmony with established truths of theology and that its advocates must have misunderstood the voice of Rome and tradition. The controversy has, from the beginning, been on a high plane of mutual tolerance. Even amongst theologians our Lady seems to be Queen of Peace. Also it has been fruitful, not only in defining more clearly our Lady's recognised prerogatives, but in deepening the study of the great doctrines of the redemption, merit, satisfaction, the meaning of the supernatural. What Pius XII says in the *'Mystici Corporis'* about the study of the inhabitation of the Holy Spirit applies to this topic: "Well-directed and earnest study of the doctrine and the clash of diverse opinions and their discussion, provided the love of truth and due submission to the Church be the arbiter, will soon open rich and bright vistas, whose light will help to progress in kindred sacred sciences." It is proposed here briefly to examine the arguments put forward in favour of the new opinion, and to consider the replies made to the chief objection brought forward by those who oppose the new view.

Have the Roman Pontiffs, in official or semi-official utterances, taught the new doctrine? Fr. Sylvester O'Brien, O.F.M., has no doubt. "*Roma locuta est . . . The Popes' words inculcating the doctrine are . . . clear and emphatic*". (Clergy Review, March, 1942, p. 106.). Two

months later in the same periodical Canon G. D. Smith, whose admirable book, 'Mary's Part in Our Redemption', shows how anxious he is to honour our Lady, finds the Papal utterances far from clear. If we search the ASS and AAS of recent years and—at second-hand—other available sources, between twenty and thirty passages might be cited in which the Popes refer to Mary's redemptive activity. Now it is true that the Popes, in these passages, speak of our Lady as Co-redeemer or use equivalent terms. But the mistake seems to have been made of seizing on a word without attending to its ambiguity or its context. An examination of such passages shows that, in not a single passage, is it indicated that the redemption in which our Lady shared immediately, was primary redemption. In some of the passages adduced it is clear from the context that the Popes were thinking of Mary, only in relation to secondary redemption. A few of the passages that seem favourable to the new doctrine may be examined. Pius XI, speaking to the Society of Catholic Women of Rome in December, 1923, said that he ".... rejoiced from the depths of his heart that they were desirous of participating in the work which was the most exalted glory of their heavenly Mother, Most Holy Mary, the woman who wished to repair the sin of the first woman, and consequently as Co-redemptrix, shared the work of the Divine Son, the Redeemer". Surely the Pope can, in this passage, be referring only to Mary's place in secondary redemption. He praises the women for desiring to share in Mary's work. But if that work were meriting primary redemption the women could not be desirous of sharing it. Such participation would be impossible. What is more, reference to the original text of the discourse shows that the Pope did not say that Mary 'shared' but that she 'shares' the work of redemption. The alteration of tense in the translation makes it possible to connect the Pope's words with the past redemptive work of Calvary. The correct tense shows that he was referring to a work that is still going on, a work mentioned daily in the Mass where the faithful offer the Sacrifice 'pro redemptione animarum suarum'. We may notice that, in reality, the Pope's words tell against the new doctrine. For he says that the work of Mary to which he refers, is her most exalted glory. As the context shows that he is referring to the work of subjective redemption, he places this as her highest glory, which he could not do if she shared also in objective redemption. Another much-quoted passage, taken from the 'Inter Sodalicia', (Benedict XV, March 22, 1918) has its meaning clarified by the context. The words are: "Mary abdicated her maternal rights over her Son for man's salvation and, in order to appease God's justice, immolated her Son, so far as it lay with her". But if we read on we find that the Pope is leading up to the doctrine that all the graces purchased by the act which redeemed us, are distributed by Mary, especially the gift of a happy death whereby the work of redemption is consummated in each individual. As before, the context shows that the Pope had secondary redemption in mind when he spoke of Mary's relation to the Sacrifice of Calvary. One passage, taken from the 'Ad diem illum', (Pius X, Feb. 2, 1904) is of special

interest. In its opening words the Pope might seem to affirm the new doctrine, for he says that Mary was co-opted (*ascita*) by Christ to share in the work of redemption. But, he continues: "She merits *de congruo* what Christ merited *de condigno* and is the chief agent in the distribution of grace". The Pope does not, in the second portion of the passage, explicitly exclude the doctrine that Mary merited *de condigno* our redemption. But he seems to distinguish the parts of Christ and Mary in primary redemption so sharply as to imply that they do not merit merely as principal and subordinate in the same order, but that their merits are in entirely different orders. Space does not permit of further examination of papal utterances. But it may be said that no passage clearly states the new doctrine. There are a few passages that, should the new doctrine obtain official approval, might be said to contain it. As they stand they admit of being interpreted either way.

The argument drawn from tradition in favour of the new opinion rests almost entirely on the comparison between Mary and Eve. This comparison, which Newman declares to be a patristic proverb, dates from the earliest apologist and is something more than a rhetorical simile. It is used in tradition as a basis on which is built a theory of the redemption. It stands as clearcut in Irenaeus as it does in Billot's examination of its dogmatic import. The doctrine is a part of the doctrine which Irenaeus styles 'recirculatio', the process of saving man by retracing the steps whereby he fell. Eve, unacquainted with original sin, still a virgin, through disobedience and lack of faith consented to admit the word of the devil, and so became the cause of death. Mary, untouched by original sin, ever a Virgin, through faith and obedience consented to admit the Word of God, and so became the author of life. Copious quotations from the Fathers show that they considered Mary's place in salvation as corresponding to Eve's place in the fall. That Eve played a great part in the fall is clear. St. Paul tells us, (I Tim. 2, 14) "Adam was not seduced: but the woman being seduced, was in the transgression". From Eve's connection with the fall excellent reasons may be advanced for connecting Mary with the redemption. Such connection is fitting, is foreshadowed; her influence in healing should be as universal as was Eve's in wounding. All this certainly points to her as Universal Mediatrix. But no patristic passage assigns to Mary direct causality in primary redemption. Further, if we are asked to argue from the dogmatic value of the analogy, then we must assert that it actually tells against the new opinion. For St. Paul, when he discusses the cause of original sin in the fifth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, insists that it came into the world through Adam alone. And, comparing the fall with the redemption, he is equally insistent that through one Man alone came salvation. Eve was not the immediate cause of original sin; therefore, we may argue, Mary is not the immediate cause of salvation. The place of Eve was in the sphere of mediate causality. She induced Adam to sin and that sin of Adam is the originating sin from which original sin is transmitted to the race. So Mary is the mediate cause of redemption. She consented to the Incar-

nation and to the redemptive activity of Christ, and the act of Christ is the source from which grace flows to men. St. Thomas puts the Catholic teaching succinctly when he asks, (1, 2. 81. 5), "Whether if Adam had not sinned, but Eve sinned, their posterity would contract original sin?". His reply is: "If, though Eve sinned, Adam had not sinned, original sin would not have been transmitted to posterity; the opposite being true if Adam had sinned and Eve had not sinned". The analogy, if it is introduced into the controversy at all, seems to tell against the new doctrine.

When the supporters of the new opinion, passing from the teaching of the "magisterium" and traditions, enter the arena of theological discussion, they are almost entirely on the defensive. It seems probable that the main attack upon them will come from positions long since prepared by St. Thomas (3.48) in the questions where he treats the effects of the Passion and the meaning of redemption. In the fifth article of the question just cited he pertinently asks: "*Utrum esse redemptorem sit proprium Christi?*" and answers affirmatively, stating that the redemption pertains immediately to the Man Christ. But while this attack is developing the main trouble comes from the old axiom, admitted on both sides, '*principium meriti non cadit sub merito*'. Applying it to the present discussion, we ask, how can Mary be a meritorious cause of redemption when her own merits have the redemption as their cause? If Mary is to merit condignly she must be free from sin. But her freedom from sin is the result of the redemption. She cannot cause the redemption if she needs the effects of it before she is apt to be its cause. The difficulty is obvious. It may be met in two ways. If it is admitted that, as in the case of other pure creatures, the sanctity of Mary is the effect of redemption, then some system must be devised under which Mary, being first redeemed, is then associated with Christ in redeeming the rest of the race. The other way of escape is to deny that Mary's sanctity is the fruit of the redemption.

Let us consider the first way of getting round the difficulty. Dr. Holland writing in the *Clergy Review* (February, 1942) suggests that an analogy might be drawn from the process of justification of an adult outside the Sacrament of Penance. In such a case contrition, or the love of God for Himself, is the ultimate disposition for the infusion of sanctifying grace. How is that supernatural act of contrition made? Some theologians,—the majority, according to Dr. Holland—teach that the supernatural love of God is achieved by the incoming sanctifying grace to which the love is a disposition. To use his own words there is 'a dovetailing of causalities'. It may be questioned whether this is the commoner view. It is certainly unnecessary and those who hold it rely on some words of St. Thomas, (1, 2. 113. 8), which by no means demand such an interpretation. Further, it may be noted that theologians who defend this view are at pains to clear themselves of the charge of admitting mutual causality. (cf. Vasquez, 1, 2. 211.). They try to prove that the causes are in different orders. But in the present case no such escape is possible. Mary's sanctity, if due to the redemption,

is, in the new doctrine, both cause and effect in the one order of meritorious causality. In any case Dr. Holland has only fallen back on a position which suffers from the same weakness as the original position. He has to meet the same difficulty in two places instead of one.

Other solutions belonging to this class show slight variations. They may be summed up as follows. There was but one act of redemption, by which both Mary and we ourselves are redeemed. But God, in decreeing the redemption, had two decrees. The first was that Mary should be redeemed: the second that Mary, thus redeemed, should be associated with Christ in offering the redeeming Sacrifice for the rest of the race. This brings us to consider what we mean by putting 'stages', 'signa', 'priority of decrees' in the provident mind and will of God. Billuart, (*De Incarn.* III. 3), briefly describes the process. "In God there is not a multiplicity of acts of which some are before and some after, as with us, but God by a single, perfectly simple act, understands, wishes, ordains, decrees. Nevertheless, we, on account of our limitations, are accustomed to distinguish in God different stages or 'signa rationis', which, indeed, are not distinct on the side of God but on the side of the objects. This accords with our way of thinking and with the dependence of objects, one on another". We find a world of created things in which objects are really related as causes and effects, as conditions and results. When we see a created cause A and its effect B, we know that A, B, and the relation between them are all the terms of one divine act, but because of the relation between them we think of God as first decreeing the event B and then choosing and decreeing A as the means to it. We speak of the decree to create B as prior to the decree to create A. Thus we make a distinction in the divine simplicity. It is a virtual distinction because we regard the simple act of God as the having the virtue of two causes or of a cause acting twice. It is a logical distinction, because we deny that it has any basis in God at all, at the same time as it is forced on us by our way of grasping the terms of God's activity in creation. Hence the ordering of divine decrees according to logical priority is a fiction of discourse. It has valid application only if we project into the divine act a valid logical process of our own reason. If we reverse the process, if we begin by making arbitrary priorities in divine decrees and then project them into the terms of created being, we expose ourselves to the danger of violating the principle of contradiction. Suarez, who has given the fullest examination to the process, (*De Incarn.* 5. 1. 31), illustrates the false use of this process of discourse. We cannot think of God as first making the permissive decree that the soldiers should put Christ to death, and subsequently decreeing the death of Christ. The second decree is at least simultaneous with the first. But we can consider God as first decreeing the death of Christ and then decreeing that His death should be the result of the soldiers' actions. Galtier admirably sums up the proper use of such distinctions, (*De Incarn.* 544, 3.): "In what sense can we speak of a 'prior decree' in God, since God has decreed all things from eternity and simultaneously in a single act? Really the

'priority' we speak of is only an arrangement fitting in with our way of thinking. For, in order to grasp the connection which God has willed should exist between the elements of our real order, we distinguish in the series of events what are called movements or steps in conceiving them. These may not be multiplied at will. But we may rightly distinguish, because of our mode of thinking, an equal number of stages in our thought and of logically successive acts in God. So, for example, we may distinguish the stages of 'simple intelligence' and of 'scientia media' as preceding the act of the divine will. We may not, on the other hand, first mark off a stage in which St. Paul's conversion was decreed and subsequently a stage in which the Incarnation was decreed". The ultimate test of the validity of 'priority' in the decrees of God is whether, objectively, it does violence to our mode of thought. Those who wish to place two stages in the redemptive act and, in order to do this, have recourse to a prior decree of God by which she should be redeemed before us, seem not to have avoided a fallacy. To place these two stages requires us to think of the redemption as simultaneously complete and incomplete. We cannot think of Mary as redeemed without thinking of the act of redemption as complete. And if the act is complete then simultaneously our redemption is complete. Mary's fitness to redeem us can be thought of only as subsequent to her own redemption. We cannot think of her doing an act which she is capable of doing only when that act is completed. We cannot think of her redemption as antecedent to an act to which we have already regarded it as subsequent. If we cannot conceive reality in that way, then we are not justified in placing in God an order of decrees in which Mary is first decreed redeemed and then decreed as Redeemer.

There are minor variations in the manner in which this doctrine of two stages in redemption is defended. But none seems to avoid fallacy. They all suppose a logical distinction in God that is not based on reality. They then transfer or transform this fictitious distinction into the order of created being and thus arbitrarily establish an order of dependence between acts which cannot be conceived as dependent, one on the other. The position is well summed up by Canon G. D. Smith when reviewing a recent book, 'The Mother of Jesus', by Father James, O.F.M.Cap. Canon Smith says: "In agreement with a great number of modern theologians, he inclines to the view which attributes to our Lady a share in Redemption *in actu primo*, suggesting that a solution of the main objection (viz., that arising out of merit) may be found in the distinction between 'the eternal order in which she was pre-ordained by God, and the order of time in which she was associated with our blessed Lord'. It is of course true that this distinction, as Father James points out, serves admirably to show how Mary could be preserved from original sin by the foreseen merits of a redemption yet to take place. It is, however, less easy to see how, in the supposition that there is only one Redemption, God could eternally foresee the merits of Mary both as proceeding from sanctifying grace and also as contributing with the merits of Christ to making that same grace origi-

nally available". (Clergy Review, July, 1944, p. 335). So much for the first way of escaping the difficulty from merit.

It seems that the line taken by Canon Lebon to avoid the fundamental difficulty is, in theory, far less open to objection. Indeed quite a strong case can be made for it. He holds that Mary is co-redemptrix and merited the fruits of our redemption *de condigno*, not in virtue of the dignity accruing to her from the graces of redemption, but in virtue of her dignity and office as Mother of God. The doctrine, as we have said, is ascribed to de Medrano, S.J., who wrote in 1702. It is difficult to see how writers could have overlooked its examination by Ripalda in his second volume, published in 1644. (De Ente Supernaturali. II. 4. 79). There he states that his position is a new one in theological schools. No other discussion I have seen approaches his in clearness and completeness. As usual he is very copious. There must be over 50,000 words in his exposition of the doctrine. But there is some reason for his exuberance. As he says, his doctrine on the source of our Lady's sinlessness and consequent capacity to merit *condignly*, is a new one and must be based on Scripture and Tradition. On this account his treatment of the topic is a great contrast to his usual manner, and reveals immense erudition. He displays powers as a positive theologian which we should not suspect in one usually immersed in purely scholastic disputation. He makes a thorough study of the traditional interpretation of Scripture and of the patristic evidence on the origin of Mary's sanctity. He gives nearly 300 references to the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers, cites many passages and analyses a number of them at length. He begins by stating that, as a matter of fact, our Lady's supernatural acts were performed with the ordinary helps of grace, but he asks whether their supernatural and meritorious character could have another source. The question is put in the following form: "Could the Divine Maternity, of itself, and apart from habitual grace, sanctify her person, and give her acts the dignity of supernatural acts, meritorious of life eternal?" That is the real issue in the present controversy. Could Mary, apart from the graces coming to her through the Redemption, merit *de condigno*? He follows the doctrine through in all its consequences. He asks whether she could, merely because of her Divine Maternity, merit *de condigno* not only for herself, but also for us. Having given an affirmative answer he justifies the title 'Redemptrix' and twice applies it to our Lady. He says that he is only discussing a theory and only trying to establish a probability. But, as his argument develops, he rapidly reaches the position that, as a fact, Mary's actions were doubly dignified, both by sanctifying grace and by her Divine Motherhood, and chiefly by her Motherhood. He feels that he has gone beyond his originally declared intention, but ends by saying that, though he had meant merely to put forward arguments and leave them for others to weigh, he had been carried away by the ardour of discussion and by his love for the Blessed Virgin. He consoles himself for any indiscretion by telling us that he submitted his arguments to very many of the most learned and weighty theologians of

Salamanca and Alcala, and that they have agreed that he has established 'probabilitatem sanctam certamque'. What can be said of this theory?

There is nothing impossible in a principle of merit other than sanctifying grace. The Hypostatic Union, prescinding from Christ's plenitude of grace, dignified our Lord's actions to an infinite degree. Sanctifying grace was also present to elevate them intrinsically, but, even without that grace, they had a moral value which grace could not give them. Nor is it impossible for the soul to be gifted with a created principle of holiness higher than sanctifying grace. St. Thomas considers the grace indwelling in Christ to have been specifically the same as our grace. But that is a question of fact, not of necessity, and Billot clearly inclines to the view that our Lord may well have possessed a species of grace higher than ours. It is then quite reasonable to ask whether our Lady possessed such a distinctive principle of holiness. Ripalda's doctrine is that the Divine Maternity was such a principle. His lengthy argument may be summarised as follows. The teaching of the Fathers and their explanation of Scripture show that the Divine Maternity conferred on Mary a holiness, not merely greater in intensity than that due to the form of grace, but distinct in kind, higher than can be conferred by the most intense grace. Nor do they assign any other principle of this holiness except the Divine Maternity and its exigency. Also they assign to her certain qualities as due to her maternity, which qualities do not arise from habitual grace. Such are her sinlessness, her impeccability. They further argue that the dignity of Mother of God is supernatural and is higher and more sublime than the dignity originating in grace. It must then at least effect what grace effects and must dignify the acts of the Mother of God. Further, Ripalda argues, while it is not absolutely impossible for grave sin to co-exist with habitual grace, it is absolutely impossible for sin, original or personal, to co-exist with the Divine Motherhood. As this is the central point of the discussion, how our Lady is, from her conception to her death, in the friendship of God, the matter is argued at length and with vigour. In particular, the Immaculate Conception is established as a necessary and immediate consequence of Mary's foreseen consent to accept the office of Mother of God. It can hardly be denied that Ripalda makes a strong case for his doctrine. Having established it to his satisfaction he goes on to draw conclusions from it. The conclusion most important for our theme is that Mary; apart from the graces she received through the redemption, could merit condignly for herself and us. He does not assert that she actually merited in this way. The intrinsic value of her actions would not oblige God to accept them as satisfactory. Whether they were so accepted he does not formally discuss. At times he appears to assume it.

Ripalda's discussion might seem to establish a sound theological basis for the doctrine of Canon Lebon. God could have sanctified Mary and accepted her works merely because of her office. But did he

do so? Since Ripalda wrote, the official teaching of the Church seems to exclude the Divine Maternity as the immediate principle of Mary's holiness or, at least, to attach it also to the merits of Calvary. There is no difficulty in allowing that she was sanctified through a double claim. A king wishing to honour his mother might give her a post carrying with it certain rewards. But if the Redemption was Mary's title to holiness or an element in that title, then Ripalda's theory must remain in the realm of theory. The possibility that her Divine Motherhood is a complete explanation of Mary's supernatural dignity cannot stand. Now it seems impossible to read the Bull which includes the definition of the Immaculate Conception, (*Ineffabilis Deus*, Dec. 8, 1854), without concluding that the Immaculate Conception, an essential element of Mary's title to merit for us, was due to the Redemption. It was due, we are told in the definition, to the foreseen merits of her Son. Apart from the history of the definition, the context alone indicates that the word 'merits' refers not to the general excellence of Christ, but to the excellence of His redeeming Passion and Death. In three places in the Bull the merits which preserved Mary from sin are said to be the merits of the Redeemer. It seems plain that the Bull teaches Mary to have been redeemed by the same action whereby we are redeemed, though her redemption is one of preservation and not of liberation. It is true that tradition everywhere ascribes Mary's sinlessness to her Motherhood: but once the supernatural mechanism by which her sinlessness was secured is discussed, we find it ascribed only mediately to her Motherhood, immediately to Redemption. Thus in the prayer of the Office approved by Sixtus IV, (Feb. 28, 1476) we read: "*Ex morte Filii tui praevisa cam ab omni labe preservasti*". Alexander VII, (Dec 8, 1661), states: "*eius animam, intuitu meritorum Iesu Christi eius Filii, humani generis Redemptoris...a macula peccati originalis preservatam immunem*". It is from Alexander VII's Bull that Pius IX drew the words of his dogmatic definition. Perrone, who is known to have been much engaged in the discussions which preceded the definition of 1854, added a commentary on the Bull to the later edition of his works. He prints the words of the actual definition which, he says, is of faith in all its parts, and adds: "The soul of Mary is affirmed to have been gifted with this grace and privilege '*intuitu meritorum Christi*'. From this fact it is clear that the Blessed Virgin is not excluded from the common redemption but was certainly redeemed by the Blood of Christ—although by the singular type of redemption which was preservative—in such a way that Christ merited for her that she be preserved from the invasion of original sin". Palmieri, writing in Rome in 1877, might seem to have anticipated the present controversy. He says that not only is it of faith from the Bull, that Mary is Immaculate, but also it is of faith that she was redeemed by the merits of her Son. To say she was not redeemed he asserts is not only false but heretical. This seems to be the common teaching of theologians. It is also the plain meaning of the Bull. If this is so it makes impossible the contention that Mary's condign merits may be

based on her Divine Motherhood to the exclusion of the redeeming graces of the Cross. Therefore, since she is redeemed by the Cross, she could not merit the redemption that comes from the Cross.

To sum up. A new doctrine has been urged according to which Mary shares directly and immediately in the Redemption *in actu primo* condignly meriting along with Christ the fruits of redemption for the human race. Arguments are adduced from the words of Roman Pontiffs. It seems that a meaning has been read into these words which is not necessarily contained in them, and which, in some cases, closer analysis or examination of the context excludes. Weight has been given to the doctrine, clear in tradition, that Mary holds in the world of the redeemed the place that Eve held in the empire of death. But that parallel, neither in itself, nor in its patristic use, lifts Mary to the position of an immediate, meritorious instrumentality in causing grace. If the analogy is pressed it rather serves to show that Mary must be excluded from that position. Finally the new doctrine is faced with the difficulty that it violates the axiom, not questioned by its supporters, that a first principle of merit cannot itself be merited. The various attempts to evade this difficulty leave much to be desired. Even their authors offer them more as tentative suggestions than as decisive replies. It may be that when the days of peace come again and allow theology to resume the vigorous growth that marked the pre-war years, more satisfactory replies to this difficulty will be forthcoming. Meanwhile it seems that the mildest verdict that could be passed on the new doctrine is 'not proven'.

WILLIAM KEANE, S.J.

An Irish Curé of Ars.

FATHER HENRY YOUNG, APOSTLE OF CATHOLIC
DUBLIN.

"An Irish Curé of Ars" is an epigrammatic description that has been given of Father Henry Young, whose career ran from 1786 to 1869, and to whose life and times this book has been devoted by Dr. Myles Ronan. It is a book to be welcomed on many grounds. The story of St. Jean-Marie Vianney and his merits have been duly appreciated and brought into the light by the care of contemporaries and posterity, with the happy consequence of his elevation to the altars of the Church. No such pious attention has been devoted to the almost contemporaneous life of the Irish priest. Father Young has not been canonized, nor beatified, nor, (as far as we know) has any Roman tribunal been invited to discuss its merits. One may well ask: why this difference? Is it that attentive consideration of his record has not led intelligent Irishmen to believe in the validity of his claims to be considered truly "an Irish Curé of Ars"? We hardly think so. We are more inclined to hear in the fact an echo of an old saying formulated against Irish people—that they were a "gens incuriosa suorum." They are neglectful of some of their own best belongings. Has not the saying been verified in the case of their saints? Was not Ireland, for centuries after her conversion to the Faith, renowned as an "island of saints"? Yes! Yet here are some curious facts. (1) Ireland has no saint, acknowledged as such, whose life stands nearer to us than the death-date of St. Laurence O'Toole, who died in the year 1180. The bull of his canonisation was published in 1226. (2) With this exception, no Irish man or woman has ever been formally canonised in consequence of investigations carried by a Roman tribunal. (3) Ireland possesses only one "Blessed"; that is Bl. Oliver Plunket, who suffered for the Faith at Tyburn in England. (4) To come closer to our present subject, after some 250 years of Protestant persecution there dawned slowly over Ireland something of a revival of Catholicism, during which appeared several admirable men and women, founders of religious institutes and so on. Now it hardly appears that efforts have been made with perseverance and success, with one or two partial exceptions, in the case of any of them to procure their glorification by a solemn decision of the Church. Of the last hundred years the same may be said. There have been reports of miraculous occurrence, in connection with certain persons and places; but little has been done, it would seem, toward arriving at official verification and recognition of the saintly personages who appeared on the Irish scene during that slow passing away of the Penal darkness. No reader of this book will hesitate to place its hero among the most impressive and striking figures. Nor, if he is acquainted with the life of the venerated Curé of Ars, will he fail to

An Apostle of Catholic Dublin. By Myles V. Ronan, P.P., D.Litt., Dublin; Browne and Nolan; Clonskeagh; 1944 with Portrait.

notice the strong likeness between the two men. Of the veneration in which Father Young was held by the Catholic population of Dublin Dr. Ronan quotes impressive evidences. "When he came to die, a Dominican Father who attended him exclaimed to the kneeling crowd about his bed: "A saint has passed to heaven; it is now our turn to ask his intercession for us." Nor did the signs of a popular culture weaken after that utterance by the good religious. There have been many accounts of cures wrought by the holy man's prayers and the application of his relics. One is surprised, then, to find that no movement of any official character seems to have been made. Dr. Ronan concludes thus his brief remarks on these matters: "It is thus we must leave this interesting subject, confident that his [Father Young's] work and example were of exceptional merit, and hopeful for a recognition of his sanctity. A feeble conclusion, surely; which hardly encourages "hope" for any such "recognition" to come!

But we are not inclined to cast any blame on this historian, who certainly does *not* represent in himself "a people incurious of their own affairs" or "own people." Nor is his book in general "feeble" in manner or in matter. If it has a fault it is one which is the obverse of a merit; it is that its fulness in treatment of general history leaves its central figure somewhat obscured. Instead of the insipid personal or devotional details that sometimes make tedious a "life of saint," we are always reminded by this book that Dr. Ronan is an historian—an historian of the Irish Church, to whom we already owe the throwing of much light on "old, unhappy far-off things" left obscure or confused by older narrators. He gives us, in fact, in this book an excellent survey of Catholic and general life in Dublin, as it was lived between the years 1749 and 1869,—between the last of the Penal Laws against Catholics and the disestablishment of the Protestant Church in Ireland. If public affairs have largely taken from Dr. Ronan's story the character of a personal record of Father Henry Young, this fact is, above all, an evidence of the modest humility with which the "apostle of Dublin" kept his work out of the eye of publicity, and of the difficulty with which the circumstances of the time encompassed such work as his.

Of the interest of Dr. Ronan's book from an historical, sociological, psychological or religious point of view, it is not easy, so numerous are the topics that suggest themselves, to give any account in a few pages. What is the picture, to begin with, presented to us in the chapter entitled "Dublin in the Eigteenth Century"? We see a city strangely mingled and conditioned. We see a lower middle-class and a populace that had borne during many generations a yoke of foreign rule and religious repression; above those socially a dominant class largely alien in race, culture and religion; and above both of these classes and often antagonised by both a government directed from outside the country. Economically, there was growth and development—but these were perpetually interrupted. There were industry, manufactures and employment,—with recurrent failures.

Here are some curious scraps of this intermittent history. It presented problems with which priests of Father Young's time had to deal. "No city of Europe increased more in size and magnificence during the 17th and 18th centuries than Dublin." Its chief wealth came from the woollen manufacture, which was established by English and Huguenot weavers who settled there in 1618. By the year 1698 12,000 Protestant families were employed in the industry. Their prosperity aroused jealousy in England, with the result that prohibitions were imposed, and many weavers were reduced from prosperity to want. Yet energy was able to bring about a revival in this and other industries, so that Arthur Young could write in 1779 that "since 1748 Ireland had perhaps made greater advances than any other country in Europe." But we next hear that this prosperity was "nipped in the bud by the American War of 1775."

Silk-weaving in Dublin also figured as a prosperous industry. It, like woollen-weaving, was inaugurated by Huguenot exiles—always favoured by the authorities in preference to Catholic natives. But its course was even more chequered than that of the wool-trade. There were failures, stoppages, revivals and angry demonstrations. The Irish Volunteers during the American War, declared for "free trade and a free parliament," yet in 1784 half of the persons (11,270) nominally employed in the silk industry, were idle. Cotton-weaving, from cotton imported from America, had also a precarious history; till at last, in the 19th century, the linen-trade of Dublin broke down altogether, and found itself replaced by the more enduring prosperity of the later Belfast linen-industry.

Meantime the rural population of Ireland was finding it difficult to live on the land, which was the property of nobles and squires of various degrees, all possessed of the legal right to expel their tenants at will. When these lords of the earth were told by a courageous and fair-minded Irish Secretary (Mr. Drummond in 1830) that "property has its duties as well as its rights" they were indignant at so strange and ominous a saying. Preferring to live in England (or, anyhow, not in Ireland) they carried off their incomes out of the land in which (according to Mr. Drummond's ideas) it ought mostly to have been spent; and in the year of Father Young's birth, it was estimated that the expenditure by Irish landlords in England amounted to £1,208,982. Nor was the conduct of the Irish aristocracy marked by any high level of morality; on the contrary, "among the higher classes," says Lecky, "there is some trace of immorality of a graver kind than the ordinary dissipation of Irish life". In pursuit of such dissipation we find the younger "bucks" (in particular) forming such criminal associations as the "Hell-fire Club," the "Rakes of Mallow" and the claret-drinking roysters of some other cliques.

The Dublin in which Fr. Young grew up contained extraordinary contrasts. It astonished visitors by "the crowds of beggars, the inferiority of the wines, the squalid wretchedness of the streets in the old town, the noble proportions of the new quarter, and the brilliant and

hospitable society that inhabited it. Bath, Tunbridge and the London West End envied Dublin's private mansions and public entertainments, their crowds of carriages, luxury and splendor, multiplicity of servants, profusion of dishes and of wines, dancing, concerts, masquerades, card-parties, theatrical entertainments. Such was the life of the fashionable, epicurean, wealthy or spendthrift Dubliner in Dublin's gayest time. Such was emphatically *not* the Dublin in which were focussed the interests of Father Henry Young, and which became the scene of his labors and vigils. Let us set down here some further fragments of the contemporary pictures of the Dublin in and for which he lived. They seem to bring before us another world.—

"Though the environs of Dublin were delightful, the city was bad—narrow streets and dirty-looking houses, filth and squalor, poverty, disease and indescribable misery. Beggars crowded together; a single apartment in one of those wretched houses rated from one to two shillings per week; and to lighten this burden of rent two, three or even four families became joint-tenants". An official, whose statistical duties brought him out during early morning hours, testified: "I have frequently surprised from ten to sixteen persons of all ages and sexes in a room not 15 feet square, stretched on a wad of filthy straw, swarming with vermin, and without any covering save the wretched rags that constituted their wearing apparel". One such house was found to shelter 108 people; the average for the same area would be at least 28 for each house. The sanitary conditions of the poor were appalling; and the wonder is that the plague of typhus had not made its mark more frequently. An inspector employed by Dublin Castle in 1800 wrote: the "Liberties" (region outside the city municipal jurisdiction) are a scene of the most abject poverty, depraved morals, deplorable sickness and a magazine of fury" (he means readiness for riots and rebellions); "putrid effluvia of every kind must contaminate the provisions suspended in the shops".

What of the "depraved morals"? We may charitably suppose that they mainly lay in the coarseness and grossness that inevitably belonged to the lives and amusements of those poor dwellers in the "Liberties", rather than in any blackness of vice. I have heard a very able Irishman say that in his opinion the perseverance of the Irish people in their Catholic faith and religion during the terrible disabilities which the long-continued oppression of the Penal Laws brought with it was one of the most wonderful and edifying things to be read of anywhere in history. It was, doubtless, a well-justified remark. But there were, nevertheless, sad facts on the surface in those post-penal days. It was not to be wondered at, if, for example, there was everywhere excessive whisky-drinking. Catholic distillers were kept busy—hardly any other profitable industry being left open to them; the Catholic poor were their best supporters. In 1788 the Grand Jury complained that excessive whisky-drinking not only "led to loss of health, but prevented the industry, debauched the morals of the people, and hurried them into the most shocking excesses of riot and vice." We fear that in those days

the spectacle of prosperous vice declaiming its pious horror at sin in rags was not altogether an uncommon one: it has never been rare.

In the midst of all this we gather from our historian what were the symptoms and means of a Catholic revival. Externally, there was the reconstruction of old "Mass-houses," hidden away in places bearing such unpromising names as Back Lane, Dirty Lane and Bull Alley; the building of new "chapels"—the use of the dignified word "church" being still reserved for the dim future; the starting of schools and printing-presses; all such activities proceeding despite annoying official interferences, amid outbreaks of Protestant bigotry and Acts of Parliament "to prevent the growth of Popery in this Kingdom". Pathetic is it to read the accounts of the new splendours of this or that "chapel"—splendours that to eyes of to-day might look very cheap and shabby, but which 150 years ago had on them all the light of a growing freedom and revived hopes.

But are we not straying too far, in the steps of our historian, from Father Young and his doings? No, though it might appear so; for the Father had very much to do with those varied scenes of abjectness and of revival. For some seven years the sorrows and joys of Catholic Dublin were the very soul of his activities—activities not confined to the city but extending over a large diocese. Of those activities many anecdotes survived, and Dr. Ronan has added many from records and recollections already drawn on by Lady Georgiana Fullerton and Mrs. Conor Maguire.

As in the story of the Curé of Ars, Father Young's apostolic zeal found its scope—first in duties strictly parochial, secondly in rural missions, and thirdly in certain establishments of charity or education. The vices of whose prevalence we have spoken as regards urban centres had parallels in the country districts, where inevitably lack of opportunities for the practice of religion led to conditions that were sometimes deplorable, Father Henry was foremost and indefatigable in facing such conditions. Wherever he went he supported and stimulated the zeal of the clergy—whose members were often few and far apart. Besides his fervent zeal in the more obvious duties of a missionary, he was attending to the provision of good Catholic books, he inculcated the practice of the Rosary, especially as a family devotion, he commended devotion to the Sacred Heart and charity towards the souls in purgatory; and, in opposition to a Jansenistic spirit that had made too much headway in Ireland, and had restricted among good Catholics the reception of Holy Communion to two or three days in the year, he anticipated Pope Pius X by exhorting the faithful to the practice of weekly and even daily Communion.

Whatever Father Henry preached or counselled in the ways of piety and perfection gained incalculable force from the examples which he himself gave of the practice of every virtue—including that of severe self-abnegation and penance. During his life and after his death many witnesses contributed details of his heroically saintly practices. We read how, when lodging at a priest's house he would slip out noiselessly

at (perhaps) four o'clock in the morning, kneel in prayer before the altar in the church until five, the hour at which he was accustomed to say prayers aloud for his congregation; then begin his Mass punctually so that all the people might get away in time for their daily duties. He rarely allowed himself more than one meal a day; and this ordinarily consisted of bread and tea. At night he might take some gruel; but on Wednesdays and Fridays his single meal would consist of bread and cold water. The prolongation of his life under such a regime might well seem a miracle, but he made it a reason for continuing and even intensifying its rigours. He resisted the importunities of friends who urged comforts upon him; nothing but commands from superiors could induce him to relax; while all money that was put at his disposal found its way promptly into the hands of the poor.

His own view of his austerities is shown in a letter which he wrote to the Administrator of the Dublin pro-cathedral, asking him to plead his cause with the Archbishop: "As the day approaches of Dr. Cullen's decision concerning me, I do ardently wish that he would allow me to make bread and water my diet, which is far more wholesome than any other kind, and would save me many useless expenses, loss of time and useless talk to my attendant, so that I may be like the Trappists; for of every word that we pronounce, we must render account at the Divine Tribunal. His Grace, you and I have never heard that any such simple diet injured the constitution of any man. On the contrary, the opposite luxurious diet has done much injury and shortened the lives of many. Any deviation in the least from wholesome bread and water, suppose only tea or plain meat, would involve me in useless extra expenses and breaches of my renewal of religious vows,^x for I must procure tea, sugar, milk, etc., also kettle, plates and other breakfast articles, and fires from early in the morning till evening, even on Sunday. My own wish and inclination are all against such lumber, trouble, expense and what not, all which cut short by my using wholesome bread and water, and my health far better, like the ancient anchorites and other recluses." This unusual health programme will not sound novel to readers of the life of St. John Vianney.

No form of asceticism was unpractised by Father Young. "We had a saint one time in our parish," an old woman told a nun shortly after his death; "he wore something made of bristles inside his waistcoat." Another form of his self-denial was refusal to enjoy the society of his family. In his 80th year he wrote to one of his cousins: "I received your kind note a few days ago, but must decline any correspondence, for I do not write even to my brother the Jesuit of Sylvester, much less visit them. As I never read a newspaper, I cannot give you any news. I never leave this enclosure except to go on Fridays to the Conception church, Merlborough Street".

The weekly visit to Merlborough Street was made for the purpose of confession. The "enclosure" he never left was the home for aged women at Portland Row, where he spent nearly all the last twelve years

^xIt is clear that vows of a religious order are not meant.

of his life. In the confessional of the chapel attached to this refuge, he spent most of the hours of each day, attending to the needs not only of the inmates, but of a vast variety of people who flocked to him. His room was a very small one adjoining the entrance to the chapel; his rest at night was taken in a wooden box laid on the floor, with a bare wooden stool for pillow; the box was known as "Father Young's coffin".

That such a man should be successful in winning souls and even in reforming whole parishes, was to be expected. The ascetic life has always been the most powerful magnet to draw souls to holiness. To refinements of speech or manner Father Young's apostolate owed nothing. His supernatural fervour, his unmistakable kindness and charity could both be accompanied by a sternness and severity that at times rendered him (as people said) "a terror". His zeal against occasions of sin and those responsible for them, as at drink-houses and dance-houses recall (once more) St. John Vianney; and his methods too were sometimes of a kind that would amaze at the present day. Not infrequently he would visit scenes of revelry in person; and with the help of a powerful stick put the revellers to ignominious flight.

To diminish the indulgence in strong drink, which he saw to be such a prevalent curse, he tried the plan of providing at "patterns" and fairs for the serving out of buttermilk, coffee and the like harmless refreshments, while leaflets announcing the arrangement were printed and distributed. The plan, unfortunately, did not work as a financial success.

How "terrible" Father Young could be was shown by an incident that made famous a mission he gave in the town of Baltinglass. Tight-rope dancing was an amusement then very popular and not always conducted in a very decent fashion. This amusement was going on in a tent during the Baltinglass fair, where a woman was prominent in unseemly pranks. Fr. Young endeavoured, but in vain, to induce the manager to stop the exhibition; he then took a drastic method of stopping it himself. Advancing through a crowd, armed with a knife, he cut the rope, thus bringing the dancing lady to the ground. The height was not considerable, and her agility saved her from any serious consequence, but her indignation was great. That the sympathy of the spectators was at least divided was shown by the fact that a large number of them presently followed Fr. Young to the chapel, where he led them in acts of reparation for the sins committed during the fair. Fr. Young was summoned for assault before the magistrate, and was fined £5. During the trial he occupied himself in reading his office in a corner of the court. As to the payment of the fine the only difficulty was the rivalry that arose as to who should pay it. Certain bigoted gentry of the neighbourhood had already a grudge against Father Henry for his zeal in removing Catholic children from Protestant schools. As now, the Catholic population of the place refused to visit any longer the tent of the rope-dancers, these gentry threw open to them the enclosures of the local gaol. It is pleasant, however, to read from the

parish records that during that mission several Protestants were received into the Church. Baltinglass also remembered with gratitude how Father Young erected in their chapel the Stations of the Cross and enrolled large numbers in the Purgatorian Society and in the Brown Scapular of Our Lady of Mount Carmel. These three aids to piety he loved to promote in every Church where his influence could make itself felt.

But our stream of anecdote might be quite unduly prolonged were we even to touch on many matters of interest on which we have so far said nothing. Amongst them the immense history of his connection with various good works and associations, in particular with the religious congregations founded in his time; of his activities in seasons of famine and pestilence; of his excellent brothers and sisters; of his contacts with Prince Hohenlohe, with Daniel O'Connell and other notable personages, and—perhaps first in importance, his fruitful zeal for the production and diffusion of good Catholic literature. In all these matters the reader may turn for light to Dr. Ronan's pages. His book, as we have shown, throws valuable light on a whole epoch of Irish history; but it would deserve to be widely read if solely on account of the saintly central figure it enshrines—a figure that recalled in an otherwise dark epoch the heroisms of some great lights of the Church's hagiography.

G. O'NEILL, S.J.

In Diebus Illis

FATHER TIM MCCARTHY.

Here is the story of one whose memory is an evergreen. He was born in Ballinhassig, Co. Cork, in 1829, the year of the Catholic Emancipation. Like Dean Grant, his sponsor and friend in after years, he was first intended for Law, and studied some time in that direction, but on the advice of Dr. Denis Murphy, P.P., V.F., of Kinsale, he turned to an ecclesiastical career and was raised to the priesthood in 1852 at Carlow,—really for the mission of Hyderabad, India, where a brother of Dean Murphy was bishop for over 20 years before his transfer to Hobart as Co-adjutor to Dr. Wilson in 1866. Abbot Gregory, V.G. of Sydney, and Dr. Grant, afterwards Dean of Bathurst, were on a tour of the Old Land in 1851-52, and being on the look out for priests for Australia, induced Father McCarthy to volunteer. The party, which included also Fathers Bernard Murphy, Con Twomey, Edmund Walsh, and the Rev. Mr. James Phelan, left for this country in August, 1852, and after a tedious and hazardous trip reached Port Jackson in February of the following year. Father Murphy was appointed at once to Carcoar to fill the vacancy left by Father Michael McGrath, who had returned to his native Waterford, and Father McCarthy, after a few months in Sydney, was sent in August as first resident priest to the district of New England, with Armidale as his head-quarters. This Northern part of New South Wales, though some of it had been crossed by Oxley in 1818, came slowly into prominence, chiefly because of the rough nature of the country and the absence of serviceable roads; and it was not till 1832 that settlement began. In May 1839 George James Macdonald was appointed Commissioner of Crown Lands for New England and fixed his head station,—according to his own report,—on an extensive plain well watered and sheltered, centrally situated, and contiguous to the extensive establishments of Messrs. Mackenzie, Dangar, and Dumaresq'. He called the place Armidale after the baronial estate of Lord Macdonald, a Scottish chieftain. Four years later there were 93 persons living in the locality, mostly along the track which ran from Beardy Plain to the pastoral settlements scattered round about. Dwellings and stores were built along this route and Armidale became the commercial centre of New England. When Governor Fitzroy visited the place in 1847 there were two hotels, a few shops, and some shacks of houses—most of them the property of Major Marsh who was at that time the squire of Salisbury Plains. The first priest to appear in the New England was the famous Dean Lynch, who, after his appointment to Maitland in 1838, rode on horseback over a sweep of territory radiating 300 miles from his presbytery, taking in this infant settlement. How much further north than Armidale Father Lynch went is difficult to determine, but when the district was given to Father McCarthy in 1853, it extended to the Queensland border and stretched across to the Pacific Ocean. Thus there was entrusted to the care of

this young priest an area which now comprises the two dioceses of Armidale and Lismore—and he a new chum not more than four and twenty years of age. But both Grace and Nature were working on his side. He had a simple childlike faith which is only of the Kingdom of Heaven. He was deeply conscious that his was the responsibility for the spiritual well-being of the people among whom his lot was cast. He was thorough about everything he did. He had at his command a gift of earnest speech which rose to eloquence when he preached the Gospel, and fell like the voice of an apostle on ears which had seldom heard the word of God. He was of strong athletic build and was eager to throw his physical vigour and his remarkable powers of endurance into the work to which he had put his hand. Moreover, he was blessed with a singular charm of manner—easy but hinting of latent strength, a bright wit which made him welcome at every bush fire-side, and a golden charity which looked out through searching understanding eyes on the weakness of human kind. Everyone loved him. They called him 'Father Tim'. Father Tim he remained through his career of five-and-twenty working years. As Father Tim he has passed into story and legend. He was the finest horseman of his day, at least among the priests; and at that time there were in the ranks of the clergy many a young man whose prowess in the saddle was spoken of the country through; but Father Tim was the greatest of them, and every squatter in the district—Catholic or Protestant—helped him on his way by letting him have the pick of the thoroughbreds on the run. He always chose the most spirited, and the household watched with delight as he went tearing and rooting down the homestead paddock, and they knew that the rowdy colt would be returned to them in good order topped off with the gentle manners of a lady's hack.

The ground he covered in visiting his scattered flock was immense. Three months at a time he would be away from home, and there are records of his having gone in the first year of his ministry from Armidale to Rocky River, Falkland's Plains, Buralong, Walcha, Tamworth, Glen Quin, Bundarra, 'Glen Ennis', Strathbogies, Tenterfield, Casino, Wiangarrarie, and down across the Richmond to Grafton on the Clarence. Not only was he the journey-man missionary, he had the building bent as well. On his arrival at Armidale he set out to repair and enlarge a wooden church which Dean Lynch had put up some time before. He had the place finished at the beginning of the following year, and had also established a school, the books and equipment for which he provided from subscriptions contributed by people of every denomination, headed by Major Marsh, then the Member for the district. Temporary chapels at Tamworth and Walcha followed. In 1854 he began a church at South Grafton. The *Freeman's Journal*, October 7th of that year, published his best thanks to the people of the Clarence for £150/15/—, cheerfully donated at the first meeting;—"and we," the paper continued, "take this opportunity of returning our best thanks to the Rev. Father McCarthy for his successful efforts in extensively circulating the *Freeman's Journal* throughout New England and

the Northern district of his Mission. If other clergymen used similar exertions the Freeman would soon be found in every Catholic home in the Archdiocese.' At the end of 1855 Father McCarthy was given an assistant, Fr. John Dunne, who arrived in Sydney on November 20th, with Father Birch, destined for Moreton Bay (who, at his death at Bungendore, a very old man, was the last of the priests salaried by the Government), and Father Patrick White, who later on, under Archbishop Vaughan, administered the diocese of Armidale from the departure of Bishop O'Mahony till the arrival of his successor, Dr. Torreggiani. Father Dunne acted as assistant to Fr. McCarthy for about five years. He was then at Singleton from 1861 to 1862, at East Maitland for a month or two, and at Raymond Terrace from 1863 to 1865. He died at Penrith 12th Nov., 1867, aged 36 years, and was buried at Petersham (Lewisham). The church built by Father McCarthy at Grafton was blessed on 3rd September, 1857, and was the first erected in the Diocese of Lismore. There were some Catholic settlers on the Clarence as early as 1841, but it would appear that they were without the ministrations of a priest till Father Powell called on them in 1849. He—the first priest to be recorded as having ministered in the Northern Rivers—is frequently styled Dr. Powell and came to Australia in 1845 with a band of missionaries who were French and Italian. After a term at St. Mary's, which he left for health reasons, he seems to have travelled from place to place. The Catholic Press (May 11th, 1936) said of him:—"He afterwards went to South Australia and Melbourne; in the latter diocese he was Inspector of Schools. In 1850 he was sent to Geelong. Returning to Sydney he was placed in charge of the North Shore district, and celebrated the first Mass at Manly in a temporary chapel on May 7th, 1865. Cooma (1868) was his last mission in Australia. He died in Belgium in March, 1872." The following from the Freeman would indicate that Dr. Powell was in South Australia immediately before he came back to Sydney:—"Penola, Mt. Gambier, Dec. 1st, 1855:—The Archdeacon begs to acknowledge the receipt of £25 from the Rev. P. Powell collected in the above districts towards the purchase of a free Hospital and Residence for the Sisters of Charity": and "Dec. 15th, 1855,—St. Leonards, North Shore:—We are glad to hear that the Catholics are endeavouring to build a church of their own,—a temporary one on the site granted by Government. Since Father Therry's appointment to St. Patrick's he has made a few visits and celebrated Mass on week days. But we are informed that the Rev. Mr. Powell has been appointed to take charge of the Catholics in the neighbourhood, and to assist Father Therry." After Dr. Powell's visit to the Clarence, the Northern Rivers, i.e., the present Diocese of Lismore, was attended from Ipswich, which had been formed into a separate ecclesiastical district in 1849 under Father Eugene Luckie. Father R. S. Downing, O.S.A., succeeded him in 1850, and that year came down the coast as far as the Clarence. In 1852 he handed over to Father William McGinty, who made two visits to Grafton, saying Mass on the way on the Richmond, somewhere near where the town of Lismore stands to-day. It looks as if he was the first to do so. The track back to Ipswich taken by both Fathers

Downing and McGinty was through Tenterfield, Casino, Wiangarrie, etc. The second church built on the Northern Rivers was blessed at East Kempsey, as reported in the *Freeman's Journal*, August 10th, 1861. It was erected by Father Patrick J. O'Quinlivan, who came to the country in 1855, and was stationed at Port Macquarie till 1862, and who, like his predecessors—Father Rigney certainly, and perhaps earlier men—visited the Macleay River. Father O'Quinlivan was stationed at Brisbane Water from 1862 to 1866 and at Raymond Terrace till 1869. He was one of the many of the early men whom grim tragedy stalked, and it came up with him while on a friendly call to his old parish, Port Macquarie. On January 30th, 1869, the correspondent of *The Manning River Times* reported,—“The circumstances connected with the painful event were these. On Tuesday, 22nd January, the deceased gentleman, accompanied by the Rev. Mr. O'Farrell, went for a ride along the bush road, and after passing the wind-mill for some distance in the direction of The Nobbys, Father O'Quinlivan suggested the desirability of a swim. His companion did not feel inclined and continued his ride. Returning he found Father O'Quinlivan's horse tied up, and his clothes on the bank.” The body was never recovered.

In November, 1862, the following clerical changes for the Archdiocese were published in Sydney:—Very Rev. Dean Lynch, from West Maitland to Armidale, to be assisted by Rev. George Dillon, of St. Mary's: Father McCarthy, from Armidale to Carcoar: Father Bernard Murphy, from Carcoar to Singleton: Father Dunne, from Singleton to Maitland: Father Woolfrey, from Brisbane Water to Wellington: Father O'Quinlivan, from Port Macquarie to Brisbane Water: Father B. Power, from Deniliquin to Tamworth. Tamworth thus received the appointment of its first resident priest, and Father Power, who was a Dominican, had also been the first resident priest in what is now the Diocese of Wilcannia-Forbes;—he went to Deniliquin in 1861, taking over a big stretch of country previously attended by Father Con Twomey, of Albury. A few months earlier in 1862 Grafton got its first resident pastor, for which the people of the Clarence had been petitioning St. Mary's for some time, and for which they had gathered a goodly sum of money. Father John Murphy, who had been doing duty at St. Benedict's was selected for the task. He was succeeded in 1863 by Father W. X. Johnson, an English Cistercian whose name is written large in the missionary annals of the South as well as the North Coast. Father Johnson built old St. Mary's church at Grafton, which was blessed in 1867; but his health failing he retired to Manly, where he lived privately, hoping to grow strong enough to return to his native England. It was not to be. A stroke left him paralysed for the last two years of his worthy life, and he died 23rd January, 1872. He is buried in the Priest's Portion of the old Petersham Cemetery, near St. Thomas' Church, Lewisham. In March, 1863, Father Cornelius D. Coughlan (sometimes spelt Coghlan) went to Port Macquarie with a parish which extended from the Manning to the Macleay. Like Father

Power, Coughlan was a Dominican; he was born in Clonfert, studied in Spain, and came to Sydney in 1843. His first mission was Brisbane Water, where he owned an island which was known for many years as Coughlan's Island, and on which he ran a banana plantation. He was a good mixer and a noted wit, which made him a general favourite. After eight years of good work on the Rivers he was brought to Dapto, where he died 2nd June, 1872, in his eightieth year. Strangely enough Lismore, with its wonderful country, did not come till many years later, when George Reid suggested the possibilities of dairying. There was a priest on the Richmond in 1877, but the spade work in what is now the chief town on the North Coast was done by Father Jeremiah Doyle, who was afterwards the first bishop.

Father McCarthy left behind him a golden memory in the hearts of every one in Armidale, but he did not receive a hundred-per-cent welcome at Carcoar. He began by planning to give the outlying districts a more frequent Mass service, and a correspondent of the Bathurst Free Press (Feb. 4th, 1863) told his paper that the new priest was saying Mass at Cowra once a month, adding that this was "a great boon as the place had been neglected," which brought a fierce rejoinder from Canowindra signed "A Catholic of the Western Plains," who saw in the boast given to the incoming man a reflection on his predecessor, the well-loved Father Bernard Murphy. After pointing out that it was Father Murphy who had erected the church at Cowra (a stone building opened in 1857), the church at King's Plains mostly at his own expense, and had done the preliminary work towards providing a church at Orange,—“while administering single-handed a district now attended by three priests from Wellington to Forbes, and many hundred miles further down that now famous river on which the latter town is built, and from Burrangong to King's Plains,—” the champion of the old order leathered the offending correspondent thus:—“Critically watch impressions arising from first introductions and appearances and be not led on by first gushings of the tide of popular opinion, no matter in whose favour they may run. You, canny Scotchmen that you are, ought well know that there is a tide in the affairs of men, and you cannot at all times calculate when the sudden time of reaction occurs—.” If there was friction, it was not between Fathers Murphy and McCarthy, who were shipmates and friends. If there had been neglect, it was not the fault of Bernard Murphy, who was one of the most energetic of the early priests. The trouble was due to the discovery of gold at Forbes and Lambing Flat, and the disturbances which were showing up, especially on the latter field. Dr. Polding was always careful to place a priest where the clouds were gathering, and sent Father Murphy to Lambing Flat to act as a check on the turbulent miners. The Freeman's Journal (April, 1861) thus notes the appointment,—“Father Murphy will go to Lambing Flat and will remain there. Carcoar, if necessary, will be attended from Bathurst.” In June, 1861, 3000 diggers on The Flat—where the town of Young now stands—rose against the Chinese, who had for some time been causing

trouble by stealing gold, polluting the water, and in a number of ways making themselves a nuisance. The police were unable to maintain order and a company of about 200 soldiers, under the command of Colonel Kemp, was despatched from Sydney. The military travelled to Young in 'busses from the Sydney streets, which looked odd enough in the bush with the names of their normal peace-time runs—Glebe Point, Balmain, Circular Quay, etc.—still showing on their notice rails. A bushranger stuck up the first 'bus that came along, but when he saw what he had, made for the scrub again. Father Murphy served in the mining camps for about twelve months. In 1863 Father Denis McGuinn, who began his priestly work in South Australia, where he was ordained by Bishop Murphy, went from Wellington as the first resident priest to Forbes (Bathurst Free Press, Feb. 9th, 1863), and Lambing Flat was given to the care of Father Cooke, of Boorowa (Yass Courier, March 4th, 1863). Father Bernard Murphy had done nine and a half years of solid work at Carcoar before his transfer to Singleton, but his reign at the latter mission was destined to be a short one. His first baptism recorded there is dated 14th December, 1862, and on 29th of the following September he met a sad and lonely death. The circumstances are given in a very old letter which has come into the writer's possession. He was taken ill at Muswellbrook, and Coughlin, the schoolmaster at Singleton, was sent for. After a very troubled night, during which the patient was tossing about and craving for cold water, a start was made for Singleton:—"Mr. Coughlin was driving the priest's buggy, and when about Grasstree they came to a stream of water, and Father Murphy, who was getting worse, asked for a drink of it. Mr. Coughlin got it, but after taking it the priest got out of the buggy and saying, 'We are going the wrong way', staggered across the road and fell. Mr. Coughlin could not lift him, as Father Murphy was a very big man. Two bullock teams were in sight and Mr. Coughlin called the drivers and asked one to go for the doctor, and the other to remain with him. The priest was dead before the arrival of the doctor, who said he died of apoplexy. The body was taken back to Muswellbrook, and next day to Singleton. A number of his parishioners went many miles sorrowing to meet the remains of their dearly beloved Parish Priest, and stayed all night at the church. The Venerable Archdeacon McEncroe preached at the Requiem and there were several priests present from Sydney and Maitland." The priests were, besides Fr. McEncroe, Fathers Sheehy, Keating, Dunne, Maher, Andrew Phelan, and Cusse. A stone outside the church at Singleton bears the honoured name of "Rev. Bernard Murphy. Aged 35 years."

When Father McCarthy took up his duties at Carcoar there was being writ there a chapter in our history which will be read when more worthy events have been forgotten,—the story of the Bushrangers of The Weddin Mountains. It is not intended in the following pages to give a ball-to-ball description of the mad escapades of these notorious men, but the activities of the priests in the field should be recorded. Dr. Polding was in this country little better than eighteen months when he

wrote in a letter to Downside (Dom Birt), "Mr. Corcoran has been the only clergyman who has been attacked since we came by Bushrangers—Mr. Corcoran was not known to be a priest, otherwise he would not have been attacked." Writing about six months later, the Bishop confessed that he himself had been stuck up on the way to Wollongong. He was optimistic when he said that a priest would not be molested by highway men. Some of them 'respected the cloth', while others did not. Father Lovat was bailed up in the first months of his colonial experience out Queanbeyan way by Doughty, who did not know he was a priest; and Father Michael McGrath suffered a like indignity from Jacky Jacky, who did not care what he was. Even in the more civilised days of 1872 Father Finn, of Murrurundi, was relieved of his horse and saddle by a bush robber named Johnson, and it was not till the Marauder was shot that the gear was recovered. Sometimes, for reasons of their own, the boys differentiated between priest and priest, for it was the man more than the office which counted with them. When the Kelly Gang dashed across the Victorian border and stuck up Jerilderie in 1879, they arrived on a Saturday (Feb. 9th) and the next day was Mass Sunday. As a preliminary to the big business to be transacted on the following Monday, they made things safe for themselves by locking up the two local police, Sergeant Devine and Constable Richards, in the cells, imprisoning the household in the residence, donning uniforms, and allaying suspicion by posing as special officers sent up on investigations connected with the bushrangers. Mass was said at Jerilderie in those days in the Court House—St. Joseph's Church, the foundation of which had been laid Oct. 13th, 1878, was unfinished. Mrs. Devine used to prepare the altar, etc., and among her many protests against being locked up in her own house, she complained that there was no one else to make the preparations for the coming of the priest. "What priest is coming?" asked Ned Kelly, and on being told that it would be Father Kiely, he sent brother Dan along to help with the pious work and, of course, to escort the good woman back safely. The bushranger worked with a will; he swept the room, arranged the forms, and pushed into position the contraption which served for an altar, but Mrs. Devine was forced to leave a note untruthfully informing Father Kiely that the family would be out of town on the Sunday, and would he be good enough to go up to the Royal Hotel for his breakfast. The blinds on the windows of the police-station were kept down during the Sabbath, the doors were locked, giving the place a deserted appearance, while the congregation heard Mass not fifty yards away, and afterwards stood around and yarned about the new police who were sent up on a wild-goose chase after the Kellys, who they were certain were no nearer than Beechworth. On the following morning the strange police took possession of the Royal and made prisoners of everyone who happened in for the Monday-morning revival. Others likely to be dangerous were gathered in and guarded, and then business was transacted at the Bank. £2400 was taken, also a thoroughbred mare from the stables of the Hotel. Joe Byrne was sent ahead with the

booty while the rest of the gang galloped up and down the main street shooting with their revolvers the insulators off the telegraph poles, thereby interrupting the service and treating the natives to a most nerve-racking display of fireworks. Then the Kellys left for the hills. The point in the enquiry made by Ned Kelly as to what priest was coming on that Sunday was this. Jerilderie was attended from Corowa, which had been made a separate Mission only the year before, and the priest in charge,—to whom Father Kiely was assistant,—was Father Michael Slattery, who was known far and wide as the greatest talker of his time. In fact, it was general knowledge that he talked right round the clock; and when Slattery talked anything might happen; for when he talked he rambled along in a non-stop run and touched on every subject under the sun; but when Slattery talked, that is when he really talked, there was nothing for it but to slip the mind into neutral and await the coming of a merciful unconsciousness—and still Slattery talked. Dan Kelly explained to Mrs. Devine while cleaning out the Court House that had it been Fr. Slattery who was coming on that Sunday he would have had to be put in with the rest for his own protection and everybody's well-being. Despite the verbosity, Father Michael Slattery left behind him a fine record of work done in the Seventies, Eighties, and Nineties. He was called upon no less than four times to organise newly formed parishes:—Crookwell, 1876; Corowa, 1878; Temora, 1881; and Narrandera, 1884. Later, as parish priest of Wagga Wagga, he was Vicar General of the diocese of Goulburn. He and Dr. Gallagher were the first to volunteer for the new diocese when Dr. Lanigan was appointed to it, and were ordained by him at Maynooth on November 1st, 1869. Father Dick Kiely, though his discreetness appealed to the Kellys, came in for his share of bother through indiscretion. He was a noted mimic, and, like many another so gifted among the clergy, debased his talent by what is known as "taking off.. the bishop,—which indeed, if well done, is a turn with a high entertainment value, and is always sure of a good reception by the Inferior Clergy. Your wide-awake artist, however, is always meticulously careful of the time and place for the show. Father Kiely erred in this, and Dr. Lanigan, who was the easiest man in the world to mimic, but didn't think so, paid an unconscious tribute to the excellence of the performance by promoting the playboy to the Backblocks. Kiely had a brother in an influential position in the Church at Salt Lake City, and thither he transferred himself. But that was in 1886, when the bushrangers were sleeping in unhonoured graves and their daring deeds only a memory.

The highway men who troubled the first years of Dr. Polding's residence here were mostly badly treated convicts, who when they got a chance to escape did so and plundered for existence. They were often glad enough to turn the tables on their oppressors. Only rarely they hunted in packs, they mostly played the lone wolf and led a miserable life with the brand of the felon on them body and soul. Bold Jack Donohue, whom they made the song about, was an undersized specimen with fair hair and weak eyes, and was not much more than

five feet tall. Like most of his contemporaries he was no hero in any sense. The outbreaks of such as these were suppressed in the early forties, and for a time except for the pranks of an occasional practitioner the bush roads were safe enough. Then in the fifties, with the gold rushes, there came the real thing—the Gangs—who dressed for the part with red handkerchiefs round their necks, smart cabbage-tree hats, riding boots, revolvers in their belts. Well-mounted, hard-riding dare-devils they were who stuck up the squatter, made him produce the liquor and the good fare, forced himself and his womenfolk to dance with them till morning light, and then made off with his money, his guns, and his best horses and defied the police to catch them. The most celebrated Gang in all the story, with the exception of the Kellys, who came nearly twenty years later, was operating in the Carcoar parish when Father McCarthy took charge of it. It included Ben Hall, Gilbert (Dunne joined them later), O'Meally, Vane, Burke, and other minor members. Some of them had been confederates of Frank Gardiner and had been left behind to fend for themselves when that notorious leader cleared out to Queensland after the hold-up of the Forbes Mail at the Eugowra Rocks. Some of them were station hands employed by the squatters in the neighbourhood, and were easily persuaded to join up because of the easy way money could be got, and because of the apparent glamour of the life. They were all young men, most of them in the early twenties, some of them not out of their teens, and were for the greater part sprung from low grade uninstructed families carrying on in the rough ways of shanty-keepers and struggling settlers in and about the Weddin Mountains,—a range of rough scrub-covered hills which runs more or less close to Young, Grenfell, Cowra, Carcoar, etc. The evil influence in their lives which led to so much crime and to final destruction was undoubtedly Frank Gardiner. Gardiner was an old hand in evil ways. As far back as 1850 he was arrested at Portland, Victoria, with eleven others for lifting a mob of horses from runs along the lower Campaspe. Sentenced at Geelong to a term of imprisonment at Pentridge, he broke gaol and made back to New South Wales, where he had been born and reared. In 1859 he began a butchering adventure at Lambing Flat, where there were congregated some thousands of diggers. Cheap cattle were essential to the success of the get-rich-quick scheme he had outlined for himself, and he was able to induce many of the raw youths of the district to round up the stragglers in the Weddin Hills. He was a dashing type of young man, well-dressed, owned the best horses in the locality, and always had money in abundance. How he was getting it was clear enough, and neighbouring families worried about the chumship which was springing up between one or more of their younger members and the flash doubtful dealer. "Gardiner will get him" was the forecast of doom uttered by many a troubled mother when the lad stayed out late at night, or disappeared for a day or two on some errand the purport of which he wouldn't explain. Then come the morning when it was discovered that his bed had not been slept in, that the thoroughbred colt and the saddle

and bridle had disappeared from the stable and the gun from its place on the kitchen wall. After that the wild boy would return only stealthily by night, to lie about in hiding for a day or two and then set off on the mysterious business once again. Very soon the police would come round making enquiries, and the only escape was to join up with others in a similar predicament and go the way of a bushranger. Gardiner was gone by 1863, but his evil influence lived after him. With Ben Hall as the leader the newly formed gang infested every road from the Weddin Mountains to the Abercrombies, as the old ballad had it, "from Humbug Creek to sweet Bumbaldrie, from Burrengong to Bogalong,"—and much farther afield as well; Bathurst, Goulburn, Gundagai, Junee—places a hundred miles and more away—were well within their orbit. Reared in the country over which they operated they knew every track to a cover like a hunted hare, every high hill that could be used as a look-out, every gully and gorge where a wanted man might hide. They were among their own kith who, if not always proud of them, were ready to harbour them and to 'bush-telegraph' to them the whereabouts of the police. They were all fine horsemen and schooled themselves into becoming superb marksmen with rifle or revolver. Anyone of them could knock a bottle off a stump while dashing past at a hand gallop. So colourful was their daring, and so sportsmanlike—if one might say it—were their actions on many occasions that they turned the heads of all the hobble-de-hoys of both sexes in the district, and even enlisted the sympathy of the people at large. That sympathy extended sometimes to those in high places. Dr. Wilson, the bishop of Tasmania, who did so much for the convicts, in a letter to Bishop Polding (31st Dec., 1863-Dom Birt.) wrote *inter alia*,—"I was greatly interested with Your Grace's account of your good work in the mountain district. The children of old Irishmen who with their warm hearts, strong sense of former national wrongs, small amount of practical religion became Robin Hoods in your mountains are not thieves so-called, but daring bold fellows. I rather admire them, and if they would shoot kangaroos instead of men they would not cause such horror as they do. I hope their reign is nearly at an end." The estimate contained in the above is not wholly true. Strong sense of former national wrongs did not enter into it at all; and they were not all of predominantly Irish blood. Frank Gardiner, known also as Frank Christie, whose legal name was Clarke, was the son of a Scotsman from an unmarried mother who came of the sin of an Irish convict with an aboriginal woman. That accounted for the swarthy complexion which got for him the nickname 'Darkie'. Ben Hall's father was a convict Englishman, though his mother was from Dublin. Vane's people were respectable English Wesleyans. Gilbert was the wild boy of a family who came from Canada; he had no Irish blood, nor had Manns, Fordyce, or Bow. O'Meally, Dunne, Burke, and Dunlevy were straight through Irish stock; but what a history was behind them. In nearly every case their fathers were lags, and whatever good leaning they might have had was flogged out of them in the chain gangs.

They themselves were baptised, perhaps, by an itinerant minister of religion—Fathers Michael McGrath or Bernard Murphy in the case of the Catholics—and then turned adrift to run wild. They were healthy young animals full of vigour, but had no education of any kind except what nature gave them, no religious instruction, no upbringing. The two influences which could mould their lives were both bad: by heredity an evil propensity had been handed to them, and their environment was an atmosphere of dishonesty and disregard for law as long as they could get away with it. They duffed the squatter's cattle and stole his horses because urged to do so by others who were great fellows in their untutored view of things. Lifting stock was looked upon by the lads of the eighteen-sixties much the same as 'pinching' apples from neighbour's orchard is looked upon by village lads to-day. If it succeeded they had no sting of conscience; if it brought trouble from the police they took to the hills. C. J. Dennis has a notable line which puts the case for the bush harum-scarums of the Weddin Ranges as well as for the city-bred larrikin,—“The hand that I had dealt to me was crook.” So bad was it that they hadn't a chance to take a trick. Sometimes, too, the cards were stacked against them. Many of them were arrested for a thing they had no hand in, and during the long brooding hours of the stretch which followed, they resolved that they would not be taken by the police again. It was no moral conversion, just a grim oath that the guns would speak before a second capture. This was undoubtedly the case with Ben Hall, who would have been a decent man in other circumstances. In early manhood he was married by Father Jerome Keating to a lass who had been baptised by Father Bernard Murphy when she was six or seven years old, and for the rest received such religious instruction as might be given, once a year at most, by an overworked priest who had to attend on horseback a parish 300 miles wide. A son was born of the marriage, and the little family lived contented on a small property near Forbes which Ben Hall worked well and honestly, except for the wretched twist which justified the practice of slapping a brand on the squatter's clean-skinned calves. Returning one day from a mustering of his own cattle—and the few stragglers—he found his home deserted and his wife and the toddler gone with a waster. The wronged man rode after them intending to tie the guilty couple back to back, and shoot the pair of them; but when he stormed into their dwelling with blazing eyes he was stopped by his little terrified baby boy, who pleaded, “Don't shoot my Mummy and Daddy.” Ben Hall was not a bloodthirsty man, not even in the years that came after, and at the stunning words he dropped the hand that held the gun and walked out with the iron in his soul. In a short space he was arrested for a hold-up in which he had taken no part. They kept him in gaol for five months, refusing bail, and when acquitted he found his station gone to wrack, his horses stolen, and his cattle dead and stinking—starved to death in the yard; the police who had arrested him had not bothered to open the gate to let them out. Shortly after, through the mere bad luck of being seen with the man who did the deed, he was

suspected of being mixed up in the robbery of the police station at the Pinnacle. The troopers gave chase, but lost the fugitive in the hills. Soon after this he was connected with Gardiner in the hold-up of the Forbes escort at Eugowra, and for the following three years terrorised the country far and wide. When Gardiner cleared off to Queensland he took with him a boundary rider's wife who was a sister of the woman Ben Hall had married. She had not been the cause of Gardiner's downfall, but he had accelerated hers. While he was serving a sentence at Darlinghurst subsequently, she took up with someone else, became a drunken wreck, and at the Thames Gold-field, New Zealand, died by her own hand. Her sister dragged on, and for many years after the curtain fell on the whole tragic business there would be pointed out at Humbug Creek a gaunt and haunted woman whose perfidy more than anything else had made an outlaw of Ben Hall.

In all this the old missionary archbishop saw only a neglected field where the sower should go forth to sow the seed. He had no more suitable man for the task than Father McCarthy. He called him 'Mack' and loved everything about him,—his boyish enthusiasm, his delight in hard work in The Lord's employ, and being no mere Sunday-in-the-park rider himself, he admired his horsemanship. In some obituary notices at the time of Father Tim's death it was stated that the appointment to Carcoar was made at the wish of the police department, which was at its wits end to find a way to deal with the outlaws, but this is probably a confusion with something which happened later. There were also stories told of Father Tim riding out in the early morning to meet the bushrangers in their hide-outs, and the police following hoping for a clue, but the priest, mounted on a hack as sure of foot as a mountain goat, would scamper down the rocky hill-side and through the thickly timbered gullies, outdistancing his pursuers; and then again when the chase grew hot, the sanguine troopers on their panting screws would pound down the bridle track only to find the holy man devoutly reciting his Office sitting by a tree. But that is Father Tim of the legend. That he met Ben Hall and his gang many times and knew their hide-outs is certain from his own statements. He negotiated the meeting with them and the archbishop, which is spoken of in a letter to Abbot Gregory then in England (Dec. 20th, 1863), as given by Dom Birt. Dr. Polding spent four days of a hot summer in the Weddin Mountains looking for Ben Hall and Co. What an incident for a biographer to happen on! "The greatest Missionary of modern times"—in his younger days he had waited for the arrival of the convict ship that he might convert or reclaim the prisoners; he had haunted the stockades at Towrang and other places to get them ready for the Sacraments; he had gone on his holy task to the solitary settler's hut and the shepherd's gunyah 300 miles from Sydney; he had worked for the Aborigines; and here he is with the three score and ten mile-stone showing up scouring the ranges seeking bushrangers. This is the picture,—an old archbishop, with his long hair whitened by seventy winters, being driven in a dog-cart through the scrub looking for a band of outlaws,—

each with a thousand pounds on his head,—who to him were merely wayward children in need of a father's advice. How far back must we go to find a parallel? The venture did not meet with the success it deserved. The police, getting information as to the place of the rendezvous, arrived first, and the gang scattered. So Dr. Polding did not meet Ben Hall. However, Father McCarthy brought him to the homes of the families from which the marauders had come, and the letter mentioned above continues, "These I saw and instructed and never have I met with persons so ignorant of the first truths, just as our prisoners used to be." By this time Father Tim already had two notable coups to his credit. He had induced the bushranger Foley to disclose where he had hidden a sum of money taken by him and Lowry from the Mudgee Mail, for the recovery of which the Bank was offering a reward of £500. This is McCarthy's own account of the incident as given by him in the Sydney Morning Herald, May 22nd, 1865:—"After one or two interviews I had with him (Foley), he informed Dr. Palmer, the Police Magistrate, Mr. McIntosh, and myself where notes to the value of £2700 were secreted, which money I subsequently returned to the Joint Stock Bank." It was stated in the Press at the time that Fr. McCarthy had received £100 of the reward, but this he stoutly denied (Burrowa Times, Dec. 5th, 1863), maintaining that, "he never received a fraction, nor would he accept a farthing for any service he might be able to render the country in his office as a priest." As a matter of truth no offer was made to him. The £500 was divided among the eight members of the police force who had brought about the arrest,—one of them had shot Foley's mate, Lowry, in the encounter. The second score made by Father Tim was the surrender of Johnnie Vane, the news of which was telegraphed from Bathurst to Sydney on November 20th, 1863. Although Vane had not taken life, he had robbed with those who had and was armed at the time, so that the policeman's bullet or the hang-man's noose awaited him. This outlaw, as notorious as any of the Ben Hall Gang, was a well set-up young man only twenty years of age. He was tall and active, a splendid horseman, of course, of ruddy complexion with dark hair and an engaging manner, his full description very different from the popular idea of a bushranger. He had had a bad deal in his childhood,—a blacksmith's apprentice at 14, mixing with the rough life of the diggings at The Turon and Tambaroora when a mere boy, bullock driving to Orange and Lambing Flat at 18, he fell an easy prey to the blandishments of O'Meally, with whom he had grown up, and Gilbert, whom he was anxious to meet because of his notoriety. Vane's first lapse into crime was the usual bit of cattle duffing which he carried out with some neighbours,—the Burke boys. The owner did not know his own beasts and the lads got away with it. Then followed a silly bush lark,—they stuck up a Chinaman with dummy guns. It was a risky joke to play in those days and in that district, and the police, taking a hand, called on Vane's people, who were respectable farmers at a place called The Number One, a few miles from Carcoar. The youth panicked at the thought of the

cattle, cleared out and joined up with O'Meally and Gilbert. He was only three months a bushranger, but by the middle of that November, 1863, there was £1000 on his head, and the following charges were on the police records awaiting an answer:—

"While in company with four others (Hall, Gilbert, O'Meally and Burke) Vane fired at with intent to kill Constable Sutton at Five Mile Water Holes near Carcoar, 6th August, 1863." Vane denied taking part in this, and the constable himself was unable to identify him, confusing him with O'Meally.

2. "Robbery of Stanley Hosie at Caloola, Sept. 23rd, 1863. Vane, with the same four, went to Hosie's store, when one of the gang put a revolver to Hosie's head and threatened to shoot if he resisted. They tied Hosie and three neighbours together with handcuffs, rifled the shop and got away with a large booty. They searched Mrs. Hosie's room and stole her trinkets. They also stole two valuable horses which Vane was the most active in catching."

3. "Robbery at Grubbengong, 26th Sept., 1863; Vane, with his four confederates, each with several revolvers, came to Mr. Louden's house and insisted on admittance. This being refused,—it was between ten and eleven o'clock at night,—the bushrangers threatened to burn the house. They handcuffed all but the women. After forcing the household to prepare supper for them, they took away with them everything they fancied. Vane strummed a farewell tune on the piano."

4. "Robbery at Canowindra, Sept. 26th, 1863;—Fully armed and mounted on stolen horses the party robbed a publican named Robinson of money and a horse, and made him supply them with liquor. Then during a period of twenty-four hours they continued, bailing up everyone who came near,—storekeepers, publicans, bullock-drivers,—having at one time 20 persons in custody, and robbing all of them. From Pierce's store on two occasions the gang took away about £50 worth of property, besides £10 in cash. They were armed with revolvers and a carbine."

5. "The shooting, with intent, of Mr. Keightley, the Commissioner, at Dunn's Plain, Oct. 24th, 1863;—"At this encounter Vane's mate, Micky Burke, was shot dead presumably by Keightley, and in a fierce lust for revenge the former tried his best to shoot Keightley in return, but was restrained by Ben Ball. Keightley was held to ransom for £500, and Mrs. Keightley did the famous ride to Bathurst to get the money from her father,—a distance to and fro of nearly fifty miles. She arrived back just in time to prevent another murder. Vane admitted his guilt in the last four charges.

After the Keightley affair, distressed by the death of his mate, Vane mooned about by himself. He tried to get out of the country by way of Twofold Bay, and Ben Hall, sorry for him on account of his youth, urged him to do so. He even outlined a plan by which the venture might succeed. Vane was afraid to put the scheme to the final test because he feared discovery, so returning to the old haunts he was about to join up with the gang again for better or worse, when Father

Tim met him. On his own statement, he did not know Father McCarthy, but had often heard him spoken of as a friend by Ben Hall when relaxing in the hills. According to the report in the Bathurst paper (Nov. 20th, 1863) Vane was having a meal, his horse was hobbled out to grass, and his gun leaning by a tree when Father McCarthy approached. On hearing the steps the bushranger grabbed his rifle and levelled at the intruder;—"Don't shoot, Vane," said Father Tim, "I am not a trooper, I am a priest. Where are your companions?" "I don't know, Sir," answered Vane, "I left them some time ago." "I have seen your mother," continued the priest, "and she begged me to find you and persuade you to give yourself up." It was a big decision to make, for it might mean the rope. "You won't be hanged," Father Tim assured him, "and I will endeavour to get you a light sentence. Think it over." Vane promised to do so, and Father McCarthy went off to report progress to the lad's mother. Together they returned immediately to where he was camped, and the good Wesleyan woman added her entreaties to the advice of the Catholic priest. The youth asked for twenty-four hours consideration. "You will find me at Mallow Grove between Five Islands and Carcoar," said Father Tim as he left the outlaw and the outlaw's mother to thrash it out between them. When it was dark the following evening Johnnie Vane knocked at Father McCarthy's door and put himself in his hands. They went immediately to Mr. Connolly, the Police Magistrate, and got from him a document which would protect them from police interference. Returning to Mallow Grove they had supper together, and after midnight started on the eventful trip to Bathurst. Father McCarthy had a half-trained colt in the stable, as he always had, and this served Vane for a mount. It would also help in the breaking in. One can easily imagine that ride through the night;—the horses settling down to steady pace in company, the low pitched voices of two men in earnest conversation, then the stretches done in silence each with his own long thoughts,—the priest and the bushranger. They passed through Blayney while the hamlet slept, and a drab grey dawn was breaking over Bathurst as they rode up its empty street. They put up at Mrs. Walsh's Fitzroy Inn in George Street, and, after resting awhile, breakfasted together and went round to the Presbytery. Dean Grant accompanied them to the police station, and nobody else, not even the police themselves, had the slightest knowledge of what was happening. Through Father McCarthy Vane made restitution of a large amount of property to persons from whom he had taken it. He returned guns and other effects to Keightley and Dr. Peechy of Dunn's Plains. The trial took place at Bathurst, April 15th, 1864—before the Chief Justice Sir Alfred Stephens. The services of W. B. Dalley were secured for the defence, and though he made one of his masterly appeals urging the prisoner's youth, that he had been led astray by others, and had voluntarily surrendered himself, and though Dr. McHattie and S. Meyer, J.P., of Bathurst, gave testimony of previous good behaviour (Father McCarthy was not called), the Judge was adamant. Bushranging had to be suppressed.

The sentence of the Court was 15 years' hard labour. Six men handcuffed together were sent from Bathurst by coach to do their terms in Sydney; at Penrith they were put on the train,—the first time the bush lad had seen one. At Darlinghurst he met some of the Gardiner gang doing time for the Eugowra hold-up. Bow and Fordyce were still there, Manns had been hanged or rather strangled to death, through the bungling of the operator, before the horrified eyes of Father Therry. Gardiner himself came along after he was discovered and taken at Apis Creek. Read, the Governor of the gaol, was kind to Johnnie Vane from the beginning, and the prisoner did not let him down. After entering on the sixth year of the sentence he was released. There was an outcry in certain quarters over the shortening of the term, and some people wanted to know who was behind it. The truth of it never leaked out, but perhaps Father Tim could have told something. Vane's first job after coming from gaol was on the building of St. Mary's Cathedral where he worked as a stonemason—he learned the trade from Bow while at Darlinghurst. He never went back to his evil ways, but worked as a miner and a station-hand mostly in the western districts of New South Wales, and died in the Cowra Hospital in 1906. He was the only member of Ben Hall's gang to escape a violent death. At the time of his surrender in November, 1863, Vane had stated that Ben Hall and the rest of the band were waiting to give themselves up to Father McCarthy, and Father Tim had interviews with the leader and was on the way to success when O'Meally was shot at Coimbla, which sent the others into hiding. The gang was now reduced to three,—Ben Hall, Gilbert, and Johnnie Dunn, but whatever the possibilities were with Ben Hall the priest had no chance with Gilbert and not very much with Dunn. When the Mail from Forbes and Young was stuck up at Binalong, Dec. 11th, 1863, Gilbert was more anxious to get the newspapers to see what Vane had really said than to secure the loot. His remark on reading the report was that Vane was a liar, and as for himself he would not give himself up to priest or parson. Gilbert was a bad lot and was regarded by the rest as a blatherskite; further, they were never sure that he wouldn't double-cross them.

In March, 1864, with Ben Hall still in the hills, Father McCarthy was transferred. This was a shock; he had only been little more than a year in the bushrangers' country, and everybody was hoping that he would succeed in bringing the reign of lawlessness to an end. The reason for the change was this: Dean Grant had died on February 25th, Father Michael Corish had gone to Bathurst and Father McCarthy was wanted to fill his place at St. Benedict's. His successor at Carcoar was Father Denis McGuinn, from Forbes, who followed the same lines with the outlaws of the Weddin Mountains; but the going was hard and slow for a new man. In three months another clerical reshuffle took place which caused further speculation. Father Corish having died in his new parish (30th June) Father Tim went as locum to Bathurst for a few weeks till Father O'Farrell was appointed July 26th, 1864 (Bathurst Free Press). This move was made by Dr. Polding at the

wish, or at least with the knowledge of the Police Department. Father McCarthy's account of it was given in a letter to the Sydney Morning Herald (May 22, 1865)—"When some months ago I left Sydney to induce Hall to abandon his iniquitous pursuits my intentions were not unknown to the Government. The evidence of this may be in existence and can, as far as I am concerned, be at once published. The mission of mine was not altogether fruitless. Hall promised me to deliver himself up within a month, which I am convinced he would have done if some of the unfortunate circumstances which surround a life of crime had not led him into deeper complications?" Father McCarthy returned to St. Benedict's to wait for more news of Ben Hall, which was slow in coming. In November, Father McGuinn made his first big score;—Jimmy Dunlevy, the son of Mrs. Dunlevy, of Tin Pot Station, on the Lachlan, came to the presbytery at Carcoar and gave himself up (Bathurst Times, Nov. 18th, 1864). A week later Father McGuinn was out at Tuena for his Sunday Mass, when he was told that Jimmie Burke (cousin of Vane's mate, Micky Burke), a bit of a lad who had gone wrong, was hiding in the Abercromby hills. After breakfast the priest went out and found him. He brought him to Long Swamp, and next day marched him into Carcoar, where he surrendered to Sub-Inspector Roberts. While these two prisoners, with several others of the same ilk were in Bathurst gaol awaiting trial Father McGuinn wrote a letter to the Colonial Secretary—Sir Charles Cowper—putting the case of his two lads before him. Cowper sent the letter on to Judge Wise, who was to preside at the Court, and His Honour took occasion to give McGuinn a severe dressing down for daring to interfere with the course of justice. The remarks from the Bench belittled altogether the part the priests had played in bringing about the apprehension of bushrangers. They would have been caught in any case, and so forth. A clergyman or anyone else who presumed to promise a criminal a light sentence if he gave himself up was guilty of a grave offence. The duty of a clergyman was to maintain order and to pass on to the proper authorities any information he might have that would be of service to the country,—no matter how he came by it. He sentenced all the accused to 15 years' hard labour (S.M.H., April 20th, 1865). Burke had been on the roads for only eight days and had committed two high-way robberies, one was the theft of a racehorse which had been recovered. On the following May 1st the Herald published a leader much on the lines of the Judge's speech, emphasising the duty of a clergyman to tell the police what he knew whatever the source of his information might be. This started a controversy on the question of privilege and especially that of the Confessional. While this was raging the following telegram was flashed from Forbes to Sydney, May 8th, 1865,—"*Sat., Noon*;—Ben Hall the bushranger was shot dead yesterday morning at the dawn of day by Sub-Inspector Davidson, Sergeant Condell, and several troopers, on the Billabong Creek, about 12 miles from Forbes. Hall received about 30 shots. He died instantly and his remains were brought to Forbes at dead of night. £74 in money, a gold watch, 3

gold chains, 3 loaded revolvers, the miniature of a young female, and other sundries were found on him." The miniature was that of his sister. Ben Hall delayed carrying out his promise to Father McCarthy so that he could arrange the settlement of some honestly acquired property on his son. He could not, of course, transact the business in person, and the time dragged on. Then he enlisted the services of a friend. The "friend" brought the police for the sake of the reward. Father Tim's estimate of the dead bushranger was,—“Whatever may be said of the justness of the retribution which terminated his career, it cannot be alleged by those who knew anything of him that he had not a disposition to make himself right with Society.” One week after the death of Ben Hall, Gilbert was shot at Binalong—betrayed by a relative of Dunn's, at whose house both fugitives had taken refuge. The host poured water down the barrels of the guns while the outlaws slept. Banjo Paterson tells the story in one of his fine ballads:—And “the smallest child on the Water-shed can tell you how Gilbert died.” Dunn escaped on foot, but was subsequently captured, and hanged in Sydney—March 19th, 1866. Father Tim was with him on the scaffold; and thus saw the curtain rung down on the tragic drama of the Weddin Mountains.

In the city Father McCarthy was as successful as he had been in the bush. After five years at St. Benedict's he was brought to St. Mary's as Administrator, and according to a statement in the paper which chronicled his death,—“his first efforts were made in the erection of a handsome and commodious presbytery for the clergy of the parish.” In 1874 he was made Dean and during the next two years devoted himself principally to the task of reducing the debt on the Cathedral. There was one pressing amount of £4000 which was worrying the archbishop, and the new dean undertook to raise it in a collecting tour throughout the city and country parishes of the archdiocese. He was successful; but by 1878 it became evident that he was breaking up. The gruelling of the hard years had brought the athlete down, and sadder still, the collapse threatened to be mental as well as physical. He had to leave St. Mary's and went to live at ‘Hawthorne,’ Glebe Road, as the guest of Monsignor Lynch, his kindly mentor in the happy old New England days. Everybody was deeply touched at the news of his retirement. No man was better known and better loved in bush and town. Through the city parishes they spoke of his masculine unaffected piety, his devotion to the Mass, his sermons with their touch of native eloquence, his lectures on “Orators of the Past,” “The Poets of Ireland,” etc., his kindness to the poor, and always of the charm and ‘the gaiety’ which had been part of Father Tim. And “out where Australia's widest”—through the Bathurst and Armidale country, each by this time a separate diocese—and on the Northern Rivers not as yet so elevated—they added tales of his wonderful physical strength, his horsemanship when in his heyday he would ride a hundred miles between sun-up and sun-down and call it only play. They told, of course, of the bushrangers of the Weddin Hills,—of Ben Hall and Johnnie Vane,

how he had ignored the thousand pounds reward he might have claimed for his part in the surrender of the latter,—and more than all they whispered the names of many men living clean and open lives, respected by their fellows, who would have joined the gang in their wild mad youth, had it not been for the paternal watchfulness and priestly ways of Father Tim: They recalled, too, his benevolence;—how many a time he had given away his last shilling; how—over and over again—he had taken the boots off his feet to help one who needed such and rode home barefooted; how he had even lent his horse to a knocked-up stranger and tramped beside him to the nearest settler's abode:—"And setting him upon his own beast brought him to an inn, and took care of him." And this fact brought the greater pride in the remembrance,—his kindness was shown not to the members of his own flock alone, but to every needy one of any class and any creed. Outback they had called him the "Protestant Priest," not as a reflection on his orthodoxy, but as a tribute to his truly Catholic charity. All these things were treasured in the memory of other days, and it was hoped that a trip to his homeland and a glimpse of old scenes and a renewal of old associations would make him again the Father Tim he used to be. That was his own wish, too, but he hadn't the price of the ticket. He was penniless. When this became known a meeting sponsored by Monsignor Lynch was held at St. Mary's, and from homes of all denominations in every part of the country £850 was collected and handed to their hero priest that he might take his holiday. With Father Keoghan as a companion, he sailed by the *Avoca* in June, 1878. Two steamers escorted the mail-boat down the harbour, and clergy and laity farewelled Father Tim through The Heads,—for ever. The sojourn in his native land accomplished all that it was hoped it would. Letters received in Sydney during 1879, full of the old camaraderie and the old drollery, and manifesting his former wholesome interest in everything that was going on around him, showed that he was fully restored to health. In every note he spoke of his love for the land of his choice, to which he would return a new man. The last communication received announced that he would be back in November, after his eighteen months' absence, and that he had made all arrangements to accompany the new bishop of Armidale, Dr. Torreggiani, and his party as far as Sydney; but these arrangements were cancelled by the onslaught of another malady, diagnosed as congestion of the liver, which took him off in a fortnight. He died at his sister's house, 25th August, 1879, aged 50 years. A Requiem presided over by Dr. Delaney, the Bishop of the diocese, and attended by about forty priests was chanted in St. Finbar's, Cork, and Father Tim was laid to rest in his native spot beneath the shadow of the church wherein he was baptised. His mortal dust is Irish earth, but immortal is his memory in the Land he blessed with his labours.

JOHN O'BRIEN.

Moral Theology & Canon Law

QUERIES.

THE VOW OF OBEDIENCE.

Dear Rev. Sir,

How does a religious sin against his vow of obedience? Some good books on the subject (*e.g.*, that of Father Cotel and that of The Brothers of the Sacred Heart) mention only one case, *i.e.*, when a formal command given in virtue of the vow is violated. Others, however, go much further. You will see from quotations enclosed herewith that, for instance, Father Gabriel in his "Eight days Retreat" and Father Fennelly, C.S.Sp., in his "Follow Me," say that the vow is seriously violated, not only in the case mentioned by Cotel but also (2) when a religious, in reply to a command of his superior, says, "I will not do it," or "I refuse to do it," or similar words which express formal contempt of authority, even though the thing commanded be in itself unimportant (Gabriel and Fennelly); (3) when the disobedience gives great scandal or causes serious inconvenience to others (Gabriel); (4) when a religious is guilty of the crime of apostasy from religion or technical flight—this is the most serious sin of all against the vow (Gabriel and Fennelly); (5) when a religious deliberately acts in such a way that he exposes himself to dismissal (Fennelly). I also saw a statement from a Regular of high standing to the effect that sins of disobedience, without distinction, are all sins against the vow. I did not agree with him, but I am surprised that the authors do not deal fully with the matter.

LUMEN QUAERENS.

REPLY.

As a matter of fact, "the authors," or at least some of them, deal with this subject at considerable length, so much so that it is no easy task to condense their teaching within the limits of space at our disposal. However, though the matter is in itself very difficult, we shall do our best to satisfy our correspondent.

Of the three essential religious vows, the most important and necessary is the Vow of Obedience. St. Thomas gives various reasons for this. One is because, by his vow of obedience, a religious offers more to God than he does by the other two. When he vows obedience, he places on the altar of sacrifice his very will, something greater than his body (the object of his vow of chastity), and something far greater than the goods of this world (the object of his vow of poverty). Moreover, the vow of obedience virtually includes the other two, because one who vows obedience according to the Constitutions, of necessity also promises continence and poverty which are prescribed by the Constitutions. It is for this reason that, in the formula of profession in use in some old Orders, *e.g.*, the Order of Preachers, the vow of obedience is the only one expressly mentioned.

In order thoroughly to understand when precisely the obligation of his vow of obedience is involved for a religious, it must be noted,

first of all, that religious superiors, both male and female, have a twofold authority over their subjects. Their first authority arises, we might say, automatically from the natural law, for they are the heads of a society which has rules to be obeyed and obligations to be discharged by all who choose to become members. Anyone, then, who freely enters such a society, thereby submits himself to its rules, and automatically pledges obedience—apart altogether from any vow of obedience he may subsequently take—to the lawfully constituted superiors in the society. If he fails to honour this pledge, he sins against the virtue of *obedience*, just as children sin against the same virtue when they disobey their parents. This authority of superiors is called their *domestic power*. They can exercise it over postulants, novices, and even over those who have already taken their vows of obedience. And if a superior, *in the exercise of his domestic power alone*, gives a command to a professed subject, and if the latter disobeys, he will commit simply a *sin of disobedience*, and not a sin against *the virtue of religion*, i.e., not a sin against *his vow*. The obligation to obey in *virtue of the vow* is involved for a religious only when the superior commands *in virtue of his other authority*, i.e., the authority which the professed subject placed in his hands when he made his vow of obedience. In other words, the obligation of the vow is involved only when the superior commands *in virtue of the vow*. From this it results that, when a superior commands in virtue of the vow, the subject has a twofold obligation to obey—one arising from the *virtue of obedience* (the natural obligation incumbent on him, we might say, as a citizen), and another arising from his *vow*. And from this it follows, too, that when a subject violates such a command, his sin has a twofold malice—one against *the virtue of obedience*, and another against *the virtue of religion* because infidelity to his vowed obedience is an act of irreverence towards God to Whom the solemn promise was made. It will be necessary to keep all this in mind when we come to consider how and when a religious sins against his *vow of obedience*.

From the foregoing it is easy to understand why all writers on this subject are at pains to emphasize the difference between what *the virtue of obedience requires* of religious, and what *the vow of obedience demands* from them. The virtue has a much wider field than the vow; failure to satisfy the virtue does not always involve sin, and seldom, if ever for religious, mortal sin; failure to satisfy the vow always involves sin, mortal or venial as the case may be. The truth of at least portion of this statement is evident from what we said in the previous paragraph. Here we would add that the *virtue of obedience* requires that religious accompany their acts of obedience with internal acts of submission of mind and heart, but absolutely speaking, their *vow* does not bind them to this. The vow binds them only to the external performance of the act commanded or the omission of what is forbidden; it does not bind them to the internal virtuous disposition now mentioned. Therefore, even if a religious mentally disagrees with his superior's judgment, nay, even if only with reluctance he carries out the latter's

commands, still, provided the external act is performed or omitted, the *vow* is satisfied, and the subject concerned, though far from being a virtuous religious, escapes sin. On the tail of this statement, however, we must dispatch a rider to the effect that, though the internal act of reluctance or rebellion is not a sin *against the vow*, it will be sinful for some other reason—pride, sloth, against charity, etc.

In order further to clear the ground, we would remark here that, unless the Constitutions of a particular institute clearly state otherwise, which is a very rare occurrence, religious are not bound by *reason of their vow* to keep the various rules of their institute. When one makes a vow of obedience in religion one promises God, not that he will observe the rules, but that he will obey his superiors when they lawfully command, *i.e.*, when their commands are in accordance with the Rules and Constitutions. His vow cannot bind him beyond that. In fact, in some institutes, *e.g.*, the Order of Preachers, it is expressly stated in the Constitutions that the various prescriptions of the Rule do not even bind under sin but only under penalty should such be imposed because of their violation. In the same way, though religious are bound *in virtue of their vow* to obey the Pope as their highest Religious Superior, still the precepts of the Church common to all the faithful do not involve for religious the obligation arising from their vow. This obligation is involved only when the Pope gives a precept binding religious alone. Hence were a religious to violate a general law of the Church, *e.g.*, were he to omit Mass on a Sunday, he would commit the one and the same sin as he would were he not a religious.

Coming now to the question with which our correspondent opens his letter—when and how a religious sins against his *vow* of obedience?—we must say that he commits such a sin only when he violates a command in which these three conditions are verified together: (1) the command must be given by one who as Superior has authority to command in virtue of the vow; (2) the will of the Superior must amount to a real command given in virtue of the vow; (3) the thing commanded or forbidden must in some way be contained in the Constitutions. These three conditions will bear some elucidation.

(1) What Superior has authority to give commands to religious by reason of their vow? First of all, as we have already intimated, the Pope, then the General of the institute, the Provincial, the Local Superior (unless the Constitutions clearly rule otherwise), and those to whom these lawfully delegate their authority. On this point there does not seem to be any difficulty that would call for further comment.

(2) The will of the Superior must amount to a real command given in virtue of the vow. The first point to be noted here is that there must be question of a *real command*. In other words, it is not sufficient that the Superior desire, however strongly, or even beseech, however entreatingly, his subject to do a certain act or refrain from it. He must intend to bind the conscience of the subject. Then, and then only, is his will *preceptive*. Of course, it goes without saying that the subject cannot be bound to obey until the Superior makes known his

preceptive will to him, and in such a way as to leave no doubt that there is question of a real command. In the next place, it is necessary that the command be given by the Superior in virtue, not merely of his domestic power, but of the special power the subject placed in his hands when he made his vow of obedience. And there must be no doubt either on this point. The subject must know that the obligation arising from his vow is involved. And there will certainly be no doubt on the point if the Superior makes use of such expressions as, "I command you in virtue of holy obedience" or, "I command you in the name of Jesus Christ," etc. But if the Superior does not make use of expressions of this kind, can there be doubt as to his mind? If, for instance, in commanding something which is evidently in keeping with the Constitutions, he does not make use of expressions such as those just now mentioned, can it be presumed that he is acting in virtue merely of his domestic power, and, consequently, that the vow obligation is not involved in the command? On this very practical point, unfortunately, the experts are not in agreement. There are those who say that, unless a Superior makes use of some special formula which clearly indicates that he intends to involve the vow, he is to be regarded as commanding in virtue of his domestic power alone. The use of their domestic power by Superiors, they say, is quite ample for all ordinary disciplinary purposes; occasions of violating their vow are not to be unnecessarily multiplied or obtruded on subjects; the Holy See itself has instructed Superiors that it is only rarely that they should make use of the above formulas, indicating thus, it would seem, the desire of not lightly creating occasions in which the vow is involved; the *Normae* issued in 1901 ruled expressly that "a religious is bound to obey in virtue of his vow only when the lawful Superior commands expressly *in virtue of holy obedience*, or *by formal precept*, or by words amounting to that." These arguments certainly carry a good deal of weight. Nevertheless, it is the more common teaching that when a Superior gives a real command in keeping with the Constitutions, such commands involve the vow, even when he does not make use of a formula such as, "I command in virtue of holy obedience." At profession a religious vows, simply and without limitation, to obey his Superiors when they *lawfully* command, and they *lawfully* command when they command according to the Constitutions. It is thus that the Church and her theologians have always understood religious obedience, and the difficulty arising from the above quotation from the *Normae* can be satisfactorily explained away. At the same time we would add here—and we shall have occasion to return to the point again later—that the Constitutions of some institutes warn Superiors that they cannot pretend to impose a *grave* obligation by reason of the vow, unless they do make use of one of the formulas we have mentioned.

This brings us to the further question—What is necessary that the command of the Superior, given in virtue of the vow, may bind the subject under the pain of mortal sin? Two things are necessary. First of all, the thing commanded or forbidden must be something very seri-

ous—serious either in itself or because of some circumstance. Secondly, the Superior must have the intention to bind the subject under the pain of grave sin. As to the gravity of the affair, this is a matter that can only be estimated on its merits in each individual case. As to the Superior's intention, there are some institutes, as we have already remarked, whose Constitutions expressly rule that there can be no question of a grave obligation in virtue of the vow unless the Superior makes use of a formula which of itself indicates an intention to bind *sub gravi*. As an example of this, we have the Order of Preachers whose Constitutions say that a Superior cannot bind under pain of mortal sin in virtue of the vow unless he expresses his command in the words, "I command you in virtue of holy obedience." The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus, similarly, say that no matter what other words a Superior uses—exhortative, precatory, preceptive such as "I order," "I command"—his will imposes no obligation even in serious matters, unless he commands, "In the name of Jesus Christ," or "In virtue of holy obedience," or uses some equivalent phrase. We must leave it to our correspondent to find out for himself whether or not the Constitutions of his own institute have any ruling of this nature. We feel sure he will find some direction or indication, or at least there will be some established custom in the institute by which members can know when a mortal sin is involved, as far as the intention of the Superior is concerned.

When the subject matter of the command is not serious there cannot, of course, be question of mortal sin for its violation. But there can be question of a venial sin. The intention of the Superior to impose an obligation of this kind is usually sufficiently expressed when he says, "I command" or "I order" you to do this or that. Here, however, it is necessary to remark that, even though transgressions of precepts that are not in themselves grave cannot be mortal sins, still, if such transgressions proceed from formal contempt of the Superior's authority, they are mortal sins. Formal contempt of lawfully constituted authority *as such* proceeds from real and true pride, and, like all such pride, is a mortal sin. But, here again, a warning is necessary. One must be careful not to mistake for formal contempt, *inspired by real pride*, the contempt which may arise from vain glory, sloth, anger, and such like inordinate motions. Real and true pride implies such an inordinate love and esteem of one's own excellence as to prompt one to despise the authority of God and of His representative. It wouldn't often happen that a religious, even a refractory one, would refuse to obey out of such pride. More often his disobedience will be the result of other passions and inordinate motions. He may fail, for instance, because he prefers his own ease to the Superior's will, or because he regards the latter's command as too severe or unnecessary, or even because he is ill-disposed to the *person* of the Superior because of the real or imaginary defects or peculiarities he sees in him.

(3) The third condition requisite to have a sin against the *vow* of obedience is that the subject matter of the Superior's command must

be contained explicitly or implicitly in the Constitutions. It is contained in them *explicitly* when the command or prohibition enforces something contained in the text of the Rules, whether it be an obligation arising from the vows, or a means to be used in order to foster the religious spirit, safeguard discipline, or secure the special end and purpose of the institute. Commands of this kind would be those which enforce the rules concerning prayer, meditation, silence, poverty, relations with externs, etc. Matters can be said to be contained *implicitly* in the Constitutions when, though not mentioned specifically in the text, still are useful or necessary to religious observance in keeping with the spirit of the Constitutions. Examples of this would be a penance imposed in order to counteract disedification given by violation of the rules, the avoidance of dangerous occasions, the employment of means conducive to the end of the institute, etc. All this can be said to be lawful subject matter of a command binding *in virtue of the vow of obedience*. But, if a Superior commands something which is not contained explicitly or implicitly in the Constitutions, as now explained, his subject religious are not bound to obey, because no such obligation is imposed by their vow. In a case of doubt, of course, as to whether something is contained at least implicitly in the Constitutions, the presumption is in favour of the Superior's judgment, and the subject should obey till a higher authority decides that the lower Superior exceeded his powers.

Reverting now to the cases in which various writers, according to our correspondent, say the vow of obedience is violated, it will be easily seen from what we have written that (1) there will be a sin against the *vow* in the case mentioned by Father Cotel, i.e., when the religious disobeys a formal command given in virtue of the vow. We presume, of course, here and elsewhere, that the Superior in question is competent to give the command, and that he commands something contained explicitly or implicitly in the Constitutions, as explained above. As to Gabriel's statement in (2) we cannot agree with everything he says. Of course, a religious sins against his vow if he says, "I refuse to obey," in answer to a command that is in every way lawful. And his conduct will be gravely sinful if the subject matter of the command is very serious. But Father Gabriel goes farther than this and says—in the presumption that the statement sent us is accurate — that, even though the action commanded be in itself unimportant, the religious is always guilty of grave sin, because his words, "I refuse to do it," imply formal contempt of authority. That seems too wide a statement. Of course, IF a religious, in saying "I refuse to do it" (i.e., a trifling matter), is actuated by real pride, and thereby shows formal contempt of authority, the statement is true. But, in keeping with remarks already made, we would think that the mind behind the "I refuse to do it" can well be other than formal contempt of authority, and when this is the case, the sin need not necessarily be a grave one. (3) Father Gabriel also says—presuming always that we are correctly informed—that there is a grave sin against the vow whenever the disobedience

causes great scandal or inconvenience to others. Here again we think the statement lacks accuracy. There may be in the case a grave sin against the vow, in fact this is likely, because, when the disobedience is such as to cause serious scandal in the community, it is very probable that all the conditions necessary to have a grave sin against the vow are verified too, but it is not the scandal or the inconvenience that involves the sin against the vow. In addition to the sin against the vow (mortal or venial as the case may be), the grave scandal or inconvenience will be separate sins against charity. (4) Apostasy and Flight: A religious who is guilty of apostasy from religion sins gravely and directly against his religious profession itself and the stability it entails. And one who is guilty of either apostasy or flight sins also against his vow of obedience. By one or the other crime he makes it physically impossible for his superior to impose on him by precept the obligations he has a right to impose on him in virtue of the vow. Consequently, he goes back on his vow, and is just as bad as if he actually received commands and disobeyed them. (5) The same is true of a religious who deliberately conducts himself in such a way that his Superiors will be forced to dismiss him. Technically he is not an apostate, nor will he incur the penalties of apostasy, but, morally, there is very little difference, if any, between the individual who apostatizes from religion and the other who by his conduct purposely forces his Superiors to get rid of him. Father Fennelly, it would appear, goes so far as to say that a religious would sin gravely against his vow even when he acts in such a way as to *expose himself to dismissal*. Theoretically that statement may be true, i.e., when the religious acts with full deliberation and full advertence to the consequences of his act. But, in actual life, we can easily enough imagine cases in which, we think, the statement would not be true. Take, for instance, an individual, somewhat lightheaded, but otherwise a good enough religious for whom, in his own way, the vow of obedience is a very sacred thing. We can easily imagine such a one *taking a risk* at something which, if discovered, would have the most serious consequences. While we would hold him guilty very probably of a serious sin against charity towards himself, we would be slow in regarding him as guilty of a grave sin against his vow.

In view of all we said in the foregoing, nothing need be said by way of comment on the quoted statement from "the Regular of high standing."

JOHN J. NEVIN.

Book Reviews

DESIGN FOR DEMOCRATS. The Autobiography of a Free Journal., by 25 Men. The Catholic Worker, Melbourne, Australia. PP. xvi—135.

This is the story of a newspaper and the part it has played in the strengthening and extending of a great national movement. The "Catholic Worker" was founded nine years ago to promote a threefold cause: Australian Christianity, the Australian National Spirit, and the Australian Working Class. The need for a paper with sound convictions on each of these three subjects, and the principles and ability, and above all, the freedom to express these convictions clearly, is only too apparent. The much vaunted freedom of the Press is but a snare for the unthinking: the Australian daily press is not free, as the "Catholic Worker" rightly contends. In proclaiming its freedom it protests too much.

From the first the "Catholic Worker" expressed its aims, its principles and its views clearly. It was a happy thought to set these aims forward in more accessible form than the files of the paper. This book should do most effectively what it set out to do: save from oblivion the early achievement of the founders of the paper, by presenting the record of their efforts and the nature of their views in articles which have appeared in the columns of the "Catholic Worker."

What a splendid record is theirs and how valuable and sound are the views they express so well can only be gathered from a careful reading of the articles. Few serious problems which affect Australia or the Australian Working Class in particular are left untouched. Take, for instance, the sub-headings of Chapter III—The Decline of the Family: 1. War on the Family. 2: A Nation is Dying. 3. The Lost Divisions. 4. The Fight for Endowment. 5. Marriage Loans. 6. Contraceptives. 7. Education for Marriage. 8. Depopulation. 9. Bureaucracy and the Family. In chapter V. a most difficult subject is analysed with admirable clarity: The question of money as it arises in "Rent, Interest, Profit, Wages." The chapter ends with a reiteration of the aims of the "C.W."

- "1. The Just Distribution of Income.
2. The Restoration of Property to the People.
3. Social Control by Representative Boards."

(Numbers 2 & 3 are explained in separate chapters).

The concluding words are:—

"We have sought to increase labour's share of the national income and to cut down ruthlessly, Rent, Profit, and Interest.

"But we have not made the mistake that most social reformers make, the fatal mistake of thinking only in terms of distributing income. For we know, all workers know, that he who distributes income, enjoys real power in industry and in agriculture. The price of liberty may be

eternal vigilance, but its only guarantee is the possession of property. And because we want workers to be free, we want workers to be owners."

There is another even more fatal mistake made by many reformers which the C.W. has avoided. They are well aware that we have not here a lasting city, and that even this temporal city will be built in vain unless God builds it. So it is a fitting conclusion to the book to end with "The Making of Men." This chapter deals with the spiritual life of the worker, the part prayer should play in it, the teaching of the Faith, the fact of Death, and concludes by warning the reader that the battle is not over.

There are three appendices: I. The joint statement by His Grace, the Archbishop of Sydney, Dr. Gilroy, and Archbishop Mowll (Anglican) on the Problem of Post War Reconstruction, 1943.

II. Joint statement issued in Adelaide by Archbishop Beovich (Catholic), Rt. Rev. B. P. Robin (Anglican), and the President of the Council of the Churches, Rev. J. C. Hughes, 'Concerning the World's Moral and Spiritual Crisis, 1943.'

III. Twenty point Programme on Christian Collaboration for Social Justice...1943.

This book should be in the hands of the Directors and members of all Catholic Action Groups and of all interested in social reform and the welfare of Australia.

"Design for Democrats" is offered as an Australian Tribute to Hilaire Belloc for his 74th year. It is a worthy little offering.

J.C.

*

*

*

*

NATIONAL CATHOLIC ALMANAC. Published by St. Anthony's Guild, Paterson, N.J. Price, \$1.00.

The American National Catholic Almanac for 1945 claims to be a condensed Catholic library of facts and indeed justifies its claim.

As an Almanac, its value in this country cannot be maintained, but as a library of facts, which extend to late 1944, its worth is invaluable.

In addition to the details of American life, and extensive general information on the Church, which the Almanac has ever featured, it this year covers papal activities of 1944, papal peace efforts and plan, the encyclical on the Mystical Body, and the condition of Church and State in such countries as Russia, Germany, and Poland.

As the Catholic's handbook of Catholic information and current Church history, the Almanac probably has no equal.

THE MOTHER OF JESUS. By Father James, O.F.M. Cap. M. H. Gill & Son, Dublin. 5/-, pp. 159.

This book is a very scholarly contribution to Mariology. The theological implications of Mary's part in the Incarnation are the author's theme, but he has not excluded those aspects of the question which make the book suitable for ordinary spiritual reading. Love for Mary will be deeper and truer the more profoundly we penetrate her pre-eminence in God's great plan, and love is not barren: "Love of our Lady demands that our admiration be sincere, and admiration is sincere only to the extent, that we imitate her virtues" (p. 20).

There are some exquisitely delicate passages descriptive of Mary's great holiness and personal privileges. Rarely have we read in Marian literature a more masterly treatment of the glories of her vocation—and, in particular, a more reverent approach to and description of her first meeting with the Angel Gabriel.

What characterizes the book when compared with other works of this kind is perhaps the "interpretative" purpose of the author; for he sets out not so much to repeat the well-known facts of Mary's life, but rather in the first place to stress the spirit of reverential faith with which we must approach the whole study of Mary, and then to bring out the profound spiritual significance of her whole purpose in the divine plan and in each of the mysteries of her life.

It may be a slight disadvantage from the point of view of the reader not trained in theology, that the line of thought and the terminology are very scholarly and technical. It is definitely not a book that one can assimilate at a cursory reading. To follow the author's thought often demands a re-reading of important passages.

The only fault is that occasional phrases in this sustained eulogy of Mary's greatness before God are open perhaps to the charge of exaggeration. On page 53 the author speaks of Mary as possessing "such fullness of grace as it was possible for a mere creature to receive." This thought is not corrected until page 59, where the position is abandoned by the more accurate statement that "she was endowed with grace more abundantly than any other creature."

Elsewhere there are phrases, which, unless read with very close attention to the context, could be misleading. "She is associated as no other creature could be with the mysteries of the Incarnate Word" (p. 12). "... had not the Holy Spirit overshadowed her, the Incarnation would not have taken place" (p. 41). "Had she failed, man could not have come to the vision of God; he would still be captive to the tyranny of Satan, and eternal death would be his destiny" (p. 24). "It is evident that the fate of man, from first to last, depended upon the response of the Virgin Mary to the invitation of God" (p. 26). Some of these remarks are susceptible of an orthodox interpretation; but as generalisations they are too broad. We have only to remember that theologians are generally agreed that the Incarnation could have taken place without the ministry of a woman at all, *in homine adulto*; and that God could have forgiven man without condign satisfaction.

J.P.G.

A CRITIC LOOKS AT THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, by H. A. Johnston, S.J. (Messenger of the Sacred Heart, Melbourne, pp 136. 3/6).

An admirable and scholarly little book. Written as an examination of a recent attack on the Church by an Anglican author, it rises far above its immediate purpose to become an able answer to the main Protestant objections in doctrine and in history. Fr. Johnston's clarity of presentation and his insistence on the prizing of truth above personal opinion make this a delightful book to read. Original sources are quoted for all historical statements, and false or misleading charges answered invariably by quotation not from Catholic but from non-Catholic books and periodicals. On every page is stamped the breadth and thoroughness of the author's scholarship. We warmly recommend this book to our readers.

*

*

*

*

"JUST SEVENTEEN," A Contribution to Youth Guidance, by Rev. Reginald Walker, C.S.Sp., M.A. Gill and Son Ltd., Dublin. Six pence.

The booklet is in the form of seven letters of an uncle, a witty, bald and wise P.P., to his niece. In a bright and interesting way it deals with the Ordering of Life, God's Providence, Temptation and the Christian Armour, the Sacraments, Prayer and the Work of the Holy Spirit in the life of the Christian. A good deal of theology is worked in and helps to give the letters a solidity not always found in matter proposed to young people. Though written for girls at the school-leaving age, boys and older people would find the letters profitable. Those who have to address young audiences will find good material in them. In his discussion of the infused virtues of Fr. Walker speaks of the moral virtues as certainly infused with sanctifying grace. Theologians usually qualify this as "more probable."

J.H.



